THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 5, 6 & 7. AUGUST, SEPT. AND OCT., 1932. VOL. XXII.

THE REFORMATION: OLD AND NEW

NINETEENTH CONFERENCE OF MODERN CHURCHMEN, 1932

By THE EDITOR

THE 18th century Englishman, unless he were a Jacobite—and Jacobites were rare after 1745—was a staunch supporter of the Illustrious House of Hanover and the Protestant Succession. He gloried, as had his predecessors for two centuries, in the Reformation. But English Protestantism is less robust to-day. In 1928 the Bishop of Durham in the House of Lords denounced without protest 'the Protestant underworld.'

In the city in which Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer were burnt alive in the faith that by their burning they were lighting such a candle in England as by God's grace should never be put out, there have of late years been established halls of Jesuits, Dominicans, Benedictines and Franciscans; and in the same city there exist side by side numerous places of worship, Romanist, and Anglican, in which the Mass is celebrated with rites and teaching so similar as scarcely to be distinguishable.

To-day Martin Luther, the greatest protagonist of the Reformation, is viewed as a vulgar, violent and mistaken man as hostile to humanist culture as he was to social democracy. And the Reformation he achieved is regarded as the parent of a malign progeny which shattered the religious unity of Western Europe and gave rise to a multitude of

> 'Petulant, capricious sects,
> The maggots of corrupted texts.'

The insatiable avarice which was the dominant motive of the English Reformation, not unnaturally became the parent of modern capitalism, which subsists on the exploitation of the worker. In contrast to the good old Medieval Church, which protected the worker and fed the indigent—

> 'The poor and trodden-down
> Blest the abbot's shaven crown'—

the Tudor *nouveaux riches*, the despoilers of the Medieval Church, instituted the hard and cruel Poor Law system by which the pauper was humiliated and half-starved. It was the Protestant Reformation which gave birth to Puritanism—the enemy of the drama, of national sports, and of 'cakes and ale.'

Preachers and pressmen, novelists and minor poets, pietists and pamphleteers have been saying this sort of thing about the Protestant Reformation in divers tones, with frequency and fervour, for the last century. Cobbett's *Rural Rides* seems to have initiated this reaction against Protestantism in England.

But the anti-Reformation campaign has many other powerful allies. The earliest of these was the Romantic Movement, which sought its inspiration in the revival of medieval life. The *Castle of Otranto* and the pie-crust Gothic of Strawberry Hill, Sir Walter Scott's *Marmion* and *Ivanhoe*, the Eglinton Tournament and pre-Raphaelite Art, dazzled the eyes of the leisured and decadent classes with the glamour of the Middle Ages. The Oxford Movement, the coadjutor rather than the heir of English Romanticism, gradually transformed the ritual, ornaments and doctrine of a smug Evangelicalism and bridged the abyss between Romanism and Protestantism in the parish churches of England. The outstanding quality of a number of the English clergymen converted to Romanism by the Oxford Movement, pre-eminent among whom were John Henry Newman, with his perfect mastery of the English tongue, and Edward Manning, with his strong socialist sympathies and powers of popular leadership, made English Romanism more than respectable.

But the strength which numbers can give to a movement in a democratic community was concurrently secured by the increasing influx of Roman Catholic Irish immigrants, as poor as they were prolific, which began to flow steadily from the days of the great Irish famine until the present time, into the contiguous areas of England and Scotland and to constitute a consider-

able substratum of the population of our great industrial cities. In addition to the Irish immigrants, a large number of exiles were driven to seek refuge in this country owing to the suppression of the Religious Orders on the Continent. As a consequence, the Roman hierarchy in Great Britain, constituted less than a century ago, can now command 'a block vote' of some millions of electors, and, operating astutely through the Press and Foreign Office, is able to exercise no inconsiderable influence upon home and foreign politics. These facts of our recent social history are sufficient to account for the changed attitude towards the Protestant Reformation in England, but three further important factors must be added to account for the changed situation.

(1) The failure of modern science to produce a philosophy, which accounts adequately for moral and spiritual values, has helped to rehabilitate the Thomist philosophy which Francis Bacon, the Father of Modern Science, and all his successors down to Herbert Spencer, viewed with contemptuous indifference.

(2) The revival of the interest in mystical religious experience has revealed a wealth of such experience in the saintly lives of pre-Reformation Catholics, and as a consequence has led many earnest souls in the Reformed Churches to turn to Romanism for light and inspiration.

(3) The revolt against the nationalist spirit—a result of the Great War—has made men of goodwill turn from nationalist and sectarian types of Christianity to one which professes to be supra-national and universal, although of course really tyrannically imperialist.

All these facts and factors have tended to diminish the prestige of the Reformation and to make educated Englishmen impatient of those gross Protestant exaggerations which had for so long represented the Pope as anti-Christ, the Roman Church as the Scarlet Woman, the Mother of Abominations of the Apocalypse, and Medieval Catholicism as a fetid mass of vermin and idolatry, revolting cruelty and sacerdotal tyranny, the parent of sexual enormities and paralysing obscurantism.

It is not surprising that there should have been a swing of the pendulum, and that 'the Bishop of Rome and his detestable

enormities' from whom our first English Litany prayed that our country might be delivered, should have become in these latter days for some Englishmen the head of 'an august and fascinating superstition,' for others, the sole hope of a humanity which does not know what to believe or what to do to be saved. And with the increasing obliviousness among us of the real causes and principles of the Protestant Reformation there is no reason why the Reformation should not fall into further contempt. The present generation does not read such epics of Protestantism as Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, Kingsley's *Westward Ho*, Motley's *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, D'Aubigné's *History of the Reformation*, or such deadly attacks on Romanism as Lea's *Sacerdotal Celibacy* and *A History of the Inquisition*, Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*, Bagot's *Casting of Nets*, and last but not least *The Ingoldsby Legends*. Instead they read Francis Thompson, G. K. Chesterton, Compton Mackenzie and Hilaire Belloc. Hence, while there is little prospect of England becoming Romanist, unless she first becomes Irish, there is a serious danger that Englishmen may cease to be Protestant, and this will certainly be so if English Protestantism is satisfied to be static instead of dynamic, negative instead of positive, iconoclastic instead of constructive, sectarian instead of comprehensive, ugly instead of beautiful, and obscurantist instead of enlightened. The Protestant Reformation was the expression of principles of truth, freedom and progress which are of essential and permanent value in Church life, and they stand in need of perpetual exposition, development and application. Bishop Lightfoot, no mean historian, was right when he wrote :

> 'If the foundation of the Church is the first cause of thankfulness, the Reformation of the Church must be the second.'

But the Reformation has not done its perfect work until it has woven into one living whole the essential and permanent elements in both Catholicism and Protestantism. It is towards this higher synthesis it should be ever progressing.

The papers read by a number of eminent English scholars at the Bristol Conference of Modern Churchmen (September 5th—10th), and here published, are intended to show what were the causes, principles and problems of the Reformation, and incidentally to explain why our fathers dared and suffered so much on its behalf.

THE FUTURE OF PROTESTANTISM

By the Very Reverend W. R. Inge, K.C.V.O., D.D., Dean of St. Paul's and President of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

THE general subject of our summer Conference this year is the Reformation. I have no doubt that it was chosen partly in view of the commemoration of the Oxford Movement which has been arranged for next year. This centenary celebration is a very dexterous move on the part of the Anglo-Catholic party, and it is causing some embarrassment both to Evangelicals and to Liberals. We gladly admit that a Catholicising revival was inevitable, and that it has enriched the life of the Church of England in many ways. The first generation of Puseyites, as they used to be called, included several remarkable men, such as Pusey himself, Newman, and Keble. They were followed by men like Church and Liddon, of whom a Dean of St. Paul's must speak with pride as well as with respect. The school of 'good churchmen,' energetic workers and organisers, of whom Samuel Wilberforce was the type, owed much to the Movement and were in general sympathy with it. The *Lux Mundi* group, who came into prominence about mid-way between the inception of the Movement and the completion of its century, contained some of the most justly honoured names in the Church of England, such as Edward Talbot, who is still with us, and Charles Gore, who has lately gone to his rest. All sections of the Church are invited to join in thanking God for a revival which produced such results and such men; and with a few exceptions, Evangelicals and Liberals are willing to join in the celebrations which are being planned for next year, hoping that their co-operation may divest them of a purely partisan character. We are willing to do what we can to promote unity in the National Church, and to show good will and friendship to a group of men for many of whom we feel a cordial esteem and affection.

And yet the main tendency of the Oxford Movement has been all along in a direction which as Liberal Churchmen we cannot entirely approve. Nor, if we go back to the founders of

the Movement, whom we are asked to honour next year, can we find it easy to put ourselves in sympathy with them. The Napoleonic War was followed by a period when England was culturally isolated, to a strange degree, from the currents of European thought. It was this isolation which made the Oxford Movement possible. France was still the enemy, and German theology was hardly known. The Oxford leaders declared war upon Liberalism, political as well as religious. They laid great stress on a doctrine of Apostolical Succession which was peculiar to themselves, a doctrine which practically divided all other Christians into those who unchurched them and those whom they unchurched. They allied themselves with Romanticism, and filled England with the Gothic of Sir Gilbert Scott. Until the time of *Lux Mundi* their attitude towards Biblical criticism was almost as uncompromising as that of the Evangelicals. We do not wish to refuse to take part in the celebrations next year, but we would rather confess our obligations to Maurice, Kingsley, Stanley, and Jowett.

Moreover, there is a logic of Catholicism, which leads at last to medievalism and to Rome. The Tractarians called their opponents ultra-Protestants, not rejecting the name which Laud and Charles I were willing to apply to themselves; their successors spurn the name of Protestant altogether, and some of them prefer to be called Catholics, pure and simple, instead of Anglo-Catholics. The movement in its present form is universally regarded as an attempt to go back upon the Reformation settlement. It is therefore impossible to discuss the future of Protestantism as if it were a question between the Church of Rome on one side and the Church of England on the other. It is conceivable that the Church of England might cease to be a Protestant Church, as it has been for four hundred years.

My subject, 'The Future of Protestantism,' might seem to be more appropriate for the last rather than the first address of our Conference. There will be other papers dealing with the history of the Reformation and of the Reformed Churches. But I do not think the order of the papers really matters. Our object is not primarily historical research. We want to gain a clear idea of what the Reformation stands for now, as a factor in the civilisation of Europe and the religious life of the European

nations, with their daughter peoples beyond the seas. We all belong to a Reformed Church; we know very well that we cannot wipe out four centuries of our history, even if we wished to do so. As Liberal Churchmen we know also that our Church is a living, growing, and changing institution. I do not suppose that we contemplate the possibility that one of the greatest nations of the world can return in sackcloth and ashes to the allegiance to an Italian priest which we threw off in the sixteenth century. Such a repudiation of our historical position as a great independent Church would be unthinkable. But the question of the future of Protestantism is a world-problem, not a local one; and besides the rival claims of Catholicism and Protestantism we have to face the possibility, which many people regard as more than a possibility, that Christianity itself may be moribund. Many non-Christian critics tell us that Protestantism is a disintegration-product, a half-way house between the old faith and unbelief. The religion of authority may, they admit, live on with slowly declining influence, because it is a religion of authority; the religion of individual conviction, they think, is rapidly falling to pieces, undermined by scientific humanism, by secularism, and by purely this-worldly aspirations. The fear that the foundations of Protestantism are thoroughly insecure is driving many into the arms of a Church which claims to be infallible. It is the old argument which Plutarch tells us that he used to hear from his father. 'The old faith is sufficient; once begin to pull it about, and you will not be able to stop.' Browning's Bishop Blougram says just the same. Does Protestantism, in spite of all its changes and its varying modes, stand for something positive and absolute, or are all our truths relative and changeable? If we are not willing to go all the way with Lippmann's humanism; if we are prepared to resist to the death the materialistic atheism of the Communists; if we shrink with horror from such a state of society as is described in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, we ought to be able to state our principles quite firmly and clearly. We are not Lutherans or Calvinists, any more than Roman Catholics. What is the impregnable rock of our Christian faith? It is not Catholic tradition, nor the letter of Holy Scripture, nor unlimited reliance on private judgment claiming to be inspired. If we are a society, as any Church must be, and not a

loose aggregate of individuals more or less in sympathy with one another, we must have some common principles, and even some common policy when these principles are assailed. We are often asked, 'What exactly do you stand for?' Many people, there is reason to think, leave our Church because they can get no satisfactory answer.

It seems to me that my subject falls under three heads—the menace of Romanism; the menace of the total rejection of Christianity; and the new forms which Protestantism must take if it is to survive.

The attractiveness of Catholicism is very complex. The strongest weapon in her armoury is mere bluff. The Catholic does not think or argue; he *knows*. He starts with certain presuppositions—that Christ meant to found a world-wide theocratic empire; that He intended this empire to be hierarchically governed; that He entrusted its officers with very valuable monopolies; that He promised this corporation an ultimate and complete victory. We may wonder that an educated man can believe any of these things; but there is a romance of the Church which is capable of kindling enthusiastic loyalty. Next, Catholicism has a longer and, we may say, a more civilised tradition than Protestantism. Its philosophy, the *philosophia perennis*, as they call it, has been ignorantly despised and neglected by secular metaphysicians and by Protestant theologians; it is now opposed by the popular relativism and pragmatism, the cult of the 'irrational,' as Continental philosophers are not ashamed to avow; but it is, I think, *the* philosophy of the Christian religion, whatever we may think of its presentment by the schoolmen. Again, Catholicism has studied and adapted itself to human nature at every point—chiefly, no doubt, to the nature of the Mediterranean peoples, who are still largely pagan; but it appeals to many northerners as well. It makes a call upon the military virtues of loyalty, obedience, and self-sacrifice, such as Protestantism can hardly make. It enslaves the intellect and makes escape very difficult, while at the same time inhibiting many of the absurd fads and follies which make Protestantism ridiculous. Its discipline is effective without being really troublesome. Its system of central government, the Curia at Rome, is one of the most ingenious of all solutions of an almost insoluble

problem—how to devise a government which shall not be justly hated or despised by its subjects. Catholicism, finally, is on a grand scale—it is an *imperium in imperio*, and it may almost claim to be the greatest empire on earth.

Recent developments have helped Catholicism in various ways. Every break-down of industrial civilisation is a victory for Catholicism, which has never favoured the modern Western type of society. Catholicism is most at home in agrarian communities. Liberalism, with its belief in individual liberty and freedom of thought and speech, is anti-Catholic; when liberty is suppressed and a dictator seizes the reins, the priest is only waiting his chance. The dictator may not long be able to do without him. In our own country the disdain felt a hundred years ago for the Roman Church is seen to be ignorant and provincial. 'Believe in the Pope!' exclaimed Thomas Arnold, 'I would sooner believe in Jupiter!' Instead of this contempt, it is now the fashion for popular men of letters—none, perhaps, quite in the first rank—to become Romanists. I suppose we might enumerate ten at least who have done so. It is useless to speculate on their motives, since they have given no intelligible account of their 'conversions'; but I fancy they have persuaded themselves that 'if an educated man wants a religion, it can only be Catholicism.' At any rate, a contempt and hatred for other Churches is very easily acquired by these apostates. Besides all this, there is a fear that civilisation is dragging its anchor and breaking loose from its moorings. What but a highly organised Church can keep the old loyalties alive? This motive has, I think, been specially strong in France, where Chateaubriand and de Maistre have been followed by Brunetière, Bourget, Bazin, Bordeaux, Maritain, and others.

These seem formidable attractions. But it is significant that while Catholicism has gained in prestige and even in numbers in the Protestant countries, within its own domain it has been losing heavily. In France, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Mexico, and South America it has been losing its privileges and its property, and has put up a very poor fight against its enemies. When we predict a possible revival of Caesaropapism in countries which are no longer democratically governed, we have to consider whether it is now worth while for a dictator to lean upon the

Church at the cost of alienating a large section of his supporters. I doubt whether even Mussolini wishes to adopt this policy. I am not suggesting that we ought to rejoice in the misfortunes of the Roman Church, which are not caused by any growth in Protestantism in those countries. I only suggest that the power of Roman institutionalism is declining, not increasing, in spite of the arrogant tone which its representatives use in England. Even in Ireland and Poland, where the Church has prostituted itself to political agitation, it seems very doubtful whether, the political aims once gained, the people will obediently tolerate the rule of their priests. Perhaps fortunately, there is no gratitude in politics.

The Revolutionary movement, which aims at uprooting all the cultural traditions of the past, is more hostile to Catholicism than to Protestantism, precisely because Catholicism is more highly organized, and more bound up with the traditions of European civilisation during two thousand years. I do not myself think that this subversive movement will win; its best chance was immediately after the war. And though the threat to liberty cannot be disregarded, I am disposed to think that the new dictatorships are of the nature of panicky measures of defence against revolutionary disruption, and that if the fear of Communism subsides, the need for repression will no longer be felt. But prophecy in this field is very rash.

The case of Russia stands apart. The Reformation was a domestic affair of Western Europe. In the East there was no Renaissance and no Reformation, because the tradition which linked Greek civilisation with classical antiquity was never broken except by oriental conquest. The Russian Empire was just a continuance of Byzantine methods and customs, but Russia was barbarised by two hundred years of Tartar domination, which cut her off from normal development on European lines. Intercourse with the civilised West has been almost entirely cut off in Russia by the Revolution, and that vast country is now much more Asiatic than European in type. Until the reign of terror is relaxed it is impossible to predict what will become of the Russian people. But it seems possible that they will have a religious Reformation on their own lines. That there will be a great religious revival is almost certain, and the Greek Church

as it was before the war will not satisfy the people, who will demand something deeper and less formal.

To return to the West. If the scientific spirit continues to dominate our civilisation, it is almost inconceivable that Catholicism will regain its power and influence. For sacrosanct authority is the death of science. Catholicism, in its determination to extend sacerdotal influence into secular life, and so to control the actions and beliefs of the common man, has entangled itself in a network of miracle and supernaturalism with which science can make no terms. We are sometimes told that Europe is becoming more superstitious, and evidence for the assertion may be found. But this playing with the occult and supernatural, in a manner not wholly serious, is mainly a pastime of the half-educated upper and middle class; the masses in Protestant countries are not superstitious, and scientific education is destroying what remained of the belief in miracle as a factor in present-day experience. It is plain that the Bishops in our Church are reluctant to censure Liberal opinions on this subject. But a Catholicism without magic and miracle would be no longer Catholicism.

On the whole, then, I do not think the Catholic revival will go much further. Protestantism may decay, but it will not be killed by the attacks of that interesting and splendid anachronism, the Latin Church, which, as Troeltsch says, stands alone by the old idea of authority, and is felt to be an intrusion into the modern world of a foreign body of anomalous character, since the ideals of modern civilisation depend for their influence on their inherent capacity to produce conviction. The modern successor to Church authority is the naturalistic system of the natural sciences.

But the authority of this secularism is far from being as absolute as the old Church-directed authority used to be. It has passed into a disruptive relativism, which promises, as many think, an unparalleled liberation of thought, but which is also dangerously disintegrating, especially in the sphere of moral conduct.

We have now to consider whether this science-directed civilisation will destroy Protestantism, or whether it may be allied with a free and progressive Christianity, such as Liberal Protestants wish to support.

It does not seem to me that secularism holds the promise of the future. Its self-confident optimism has been rudely shaken. The secular religion of progress is a house built on the sand. It has no real support from the study of biological evolution; and modern physics, of which, according to Eddington, the dismal law of entropy is the corner-stone, seems to present us only with a dysteleology of an absolute kind. We have time, ample time, for social reforms, no doubt; but the old claim that 'the universe is friendly' is not easy to substantiate. Science itself is ceasing to be dogmatic, and shows a curious tendency to play with mentalism, cutting itself loose from the concrete facts on which its whole fabric is based. A panmathematical universe contains none but hypothetical entities. Science, in fact, is withdrawing more and more into its own domain. It no longer speaks pontifically, like Huxley and Herbert Spencer; and with increasing specialisation comes increasing divergence, as in the conflict between biology and physics on 'emergent' evolution.

Humanism suffers from uncertainty about its standard of values. What makes a thing right or wrong? No clear answer is given.

We have therefore a civilisation no longer directed by any external authority, and uncertain of its foundations. If we think of some points in which it has broken with the Church-directed civilisation of the Middle Ages, we may be helped to form a conclusion as to the part which Protestant Christianity may play in the future.

It is often said that modern industrialism is the work of Calvinism. It is true that this branch of the Reformed faith entered more easily than any other into a kind of alliance with democracy and business. But though Calvinistic nations like North America, Scotland, and Holland have been in the front rank of modern industry, I think that the important economic and political results of Calvinism were produced against its will. The real influence of Protestantism is directly religious. As Troeltsch says, 'Protestantism is in the first place a religious force, and only in the second or third place a civilising force.' But it is true that, whereas medieval Catholicism condemned usury and distrusted commerce, the whole tendency of Protestantism, and especially of Calvinism, has been to approve and consecrate productive in-

dustry as a work sanctioned by God. Now, however, religion has lost its control over the acquisitive life and over the spending of money. The idealistic side of the business career is no longer prominent, and the new gospel or heresy of 'consumptionism' is flatly contrary to the thrift and simplicity of the Puritan household. We are even told that the growth of 'graft' and corruption, which were sternly condemned by Calvinism, is undermining credit in America, so that the stability of the whole structure is threatened.

The idea of our responsibility to future generations, and the inspiring hope of making human society better and happier, are entirely modern. There is nothing un-Christian about them, but they are no part of the Catholic tradition. Catholics instinctively dislike eugenics, and prefer cure to prevention. Liberal Protestantism is entirely with these secular aspirations, and believes that they are in accordance with the will of God.

Humanitarianism is another modern movement. In spite of the deplorable barbarities of the Great War, the modern man has an intense hatred of cruelty, and this is a new thing. In this work Protestantism, though perhaps the sects more than the great Reformed Churches, has played an active and beneficent part. The reform of prisons and madhouses, the abolition of the slave-trade and of slavery, and other humane movements, have been greatly helped by the Protestant Churches.

Hatred of cruelty to animals is a new sentiment and an extremely strong one. It receives no encouragement whatever from Catholicism, but all Protestants feel exactly the same as non-religious friends of the animals. Without any hesitation, we hold that we have moral duties towards the lower animals, who have their rights, just as we have. There are, of course, great differences about the practical application of this principle.

A small Protestant body, the Quakers, have taken the lead in protesting against the curse of war. Protestant opinion will be whole-heartedly on the side of pacifism and the League of Nations, as soon as practicable proposals are brought forward.

But no development of the new morality is more significant than in the group of questions about the relation of the sexes. On the question of marriage and divorce there is a vigorous revolt against traditional prohibitions, with a very confused notion of

the principles on which right conduct ought to be based. The right of the individual to an unfettered development of his or her character is strongly asserted. Society, we are told, has no right to enforce contracts which blight the whole life of a man or woman. On the other hand, we are told that the sanctity of Christian marriage, and the inviolability of the marriage vow, are not to be infringed because some married people cannot control their unlawful passions. The levity with which divorce is sought and granted in many parts of the United States, and in certain sections of society in England, is felt to be a scandal. I cannot argue these questions here. I only wish to say that Protestantism should act as the best conscience of the community interpreting Christian principles intelligently and faithfully.

Another important subject is the morality of birth-control. The secular conscience has made up its mind that the morality of this action depends on the motive. Liberal Churchmen almost all take the same view, and refuse to condemn those who limit their families from reasonable motives. Other and perhaps more difficult problems may arise about permitting euthanasia in cases of incurable illness, and the painless extinction of incorrigibly anti-social persons.

What I wish to emphasise is that the function of Protestantism is to be an integral factor in our civilisation, entering thoroughly into the life of the nation, and not as a separate society standing over against it. The National Church, which we should all like to see extended so as to comprise, under some federal system, the smaller so-called Free Churches, ought to have no 'interests' apart from the highest welfare of the people of England. It must, of course, have its organisation, without which it could not exist as a Church. But it should aim at being the nation on its religious, spiritual, and moral side. Its leaders will speak with the authority which their character and abilities command. Its councils will represent the considered judgments of those whose aim it is to understand the mind of Christ. Above all, the Church will be the home of personal religion, of piety, saintliness, and the mystical vision. This is central; all else is peripheral.

We shall have definite beliefs and convictions. We stand for theism against pantheism, for belief in a God who is transcendent

as well as immanent, the creator of the world, not a Being organic with it, growing with its growth and dying at its inevitable death. We stand for belief in a Divine Christ, a living and indwelling Spirit, once incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth, but the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. We stand for citizenship in a heavenly country, as against that secularity which, Professor Gardner has said, is the one temper with which Christianity can make no terms. We stand for discipline and self-denial against the indulgence of every appetite. We stand for the family against all who would destroy it. We stand for peace and goodwill between nations and between classes. We condemn greed and acquisitiveness in all sections of society. We believe in democracy as a form of society—that is to say in equality of consideration; as a form of government we regard it merely as an experiment to be judged by its results. And we believe that disinterestedness is the supreme social virtue.

We Liberal Churchmen are the friends of all who are working towards a new Reformation—an Erasmian Reformation. The Protestantism which we wish to see is a religion of civilised people, in alliance with science and philosophy, a religion of people who play no tricks with their souls, and who have learned to 'be true men in love,' as St. Paul says. We must bring back into our own circle those step-children of the Reformation who were roughly cast out by the first Reformers. We must make friends with secular learning and culture in all their branches, cementing that alliance which already exists in Protestant countries. We must stand firmly by our belief in freedom and faith based on personal conviction. And finally I do not hesitate to say that we must work upon our own national ideals. The best Englishman is a thorough Englishman, and the best Frenchman is a thorough Frenchman. Let the Church of England be a Church which could only exist in England, the soul of one of the great nations of the world. That will be our best contribution to the symphony of humanity—the combined orchestra of Christendom raising a hymn of praise to the glory of God the Father.

THE REFORMATION AND HISTORICAL STUDY

By G. G. Coulton, D.Litt., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

I WELCOME an occasion of this kind for the opportunity of using frankly and naturally the plain adjective *Protestant*. I believe in the Holy Catholic Church; but I do not believe that Christianity would have approached, in these present days, so nearly to holiness and catholicity (in the true original sense of universality) if it had not been for that great Protest of the sixteenth century. I believe, therefore, also in the Holy Protestant Church.

But that protest cannot be fully understood without a clear conception of what was protested against. To put protest in the foreground is to commit oneself to the weakness of a negative programme, which always leads to the under-valuation of one's adversary: one of the most fatal of all mistakes. Fortunately, it is no longer possible nowadays to regard the Reformers as infallible. This, no doubt, is a considerable tactical disadvantage for the moment; it leaves us in the wistful posture of Lord Lansdowne a hundred years ago, who wished he could be as certain about any one thing as Tom Macaulay was about everything. But, in the long run, this is our strength; for it leaves us free to learn from tradition on the one hand, or reason on the other, in proportion as our ripest judgment seems to press the claims of each. And the very essence of the Reformation is this application of reason to tradition. Professor Gwatkin pointed out very truly that, though the English Reformation sprang in one real sense from Henry's divorce, this was because the divorce question brought out a radical difference of principle between the two parties in the Church.[1] He wrote:

> 'Cranmer's counsel [that Henry should consult the Universities of Europe] went to the root of the matter; for it meant that [the real meaning of the Bible] is not to be finally determined by authority, but by sound learning—which is the principle of the Reformation, nowhere

[1] *Church and State in England*, p. 149.

more clearly brought out than in England. Henry caught at the suggestion: he was a scholar, and this side of the Reformation always appealed to him. Cranmer and others were sent abroad to collect opinions; and decisions in Henry's favour were received from Paris, Orléans, Bourges and Toulouse, Bologna, Ferrara, Pavia and Padua, and these decisions must stand for the general opinion of the learned, unless the divines of France and Italy were more generally venal than is commonly supposed.'

This appeal to the Universities was, in effect, an appeal to history; and therefore, essentially a revolution. For it brought Henry into conflict with that spirit which was so clearly expressed in my own lifetime by Archbishop Manning, when he proclaimed publicly and repeatedly: 'The appeal to antiquity is both a treason and a heresy.'[2] Those words of the Cardinal in 1875 exactly reflect the orthodox position in the Middle Ages.

It had not always been so; the earlier Christian scholars had sometimes shown a strong historical sense in practice, if not in theory. Even an apologist like Justin Martyn could be liberal enough to count Socrates as a Christian, since he died for the truth; so also with the man who may be reckoned as the earliest of Christian historians, Sextus Julius Africanus, who, writing in 221 A.D., seems to have been not less critical than the best pagan writers of his time, such as Dion Cassius and Herodian. He rejected as fabulous the story of Susannah and the Elders; and he denied historical accuracy to the two Gospel genealogies of Christ. Eusebius, again, a century later, showed some spirit of real criticism towards Bible history. But with the decay of Roman civilization and the break-up of the Empire, the institutional Church became more and more autocratic and exclusive. This was in one sense her just reward for having shown far more vitality throughout those destructive centuries than any other institution had shown. But here, as so often, victory brought its own temptations. A hierarchy which was no longer stimulated by the rivalry of real pagan learning, nor again, sufficiently controlled by a solid and highly organized state, tended to narrowness, impatience of contradiction, and sometimes even to tyranny. The pastors were far less learned than they had been in Imperial times; but they reigned far more absolutely over a flock that was still more ignorant in proportion.

[2] *Daily Telegraph,* October 8th, 1875.

From those Dark Ages the Church emerged into what we call the Middle Age. Society grew far more orderly; states crystalized into real solidity; the Church herself developed a bureaucracy and a system of Canon Law more advanced and more efficient than anything in the average state; and that Scholastic Philosophy was born which necessarily impressed its own character very deeply upon the historical writers of those ages. Scholastic Philosophy differed in one most important respect both from ancient on the one hand and from modern on the other. The thinker was, in effect, restricted within the bounds of one single book or collection of books, the Bible. For the Fathers were authoritative simply as more or less inspired exponents of the Bible; and Aristotle was authoritative only so far as he could be reconciled with the Bible. St. Thomas Aquinas may be followed here, as on nearly every other point, for the official view. He insists that anyone who denies any plain statement in the Bible is contradicting the Holy Ghost, and is therefore a heretic. He gives three instances; one which we should classify as historical, another geographical, and the third botanical. We may not deny, first, that Samuel was the son of Elkanah; secondly, that there was an actual Garden of Eden; and, thirdly, that in this garden there grew an actual Tree of Life. Many indeed interpret these three facts allegorically; and the allegorical meaning may be more important than the literal; but the literal must be whole-heartedly accepted if we are to avoid the greatest of all sins, the sin of heresy.

Greatest of all sins, and most dangerous, because orthodoxy is the most potent determining factor in the unspeakably awful alternative which awaits every human being. The last moment of a man's life decides for him between everlasting bliss and an eternity of torments which preachers dwelt upon in pages of lurid rhetoric, and finally confessed themselves quite powerless to describe; a frequent phrase was, that these never-ending flames are as much hotter than the hottest fire on earth as a real earthly flame is hotter than a painted flame.[3] There, then, was the alternative; and at that last moment, the main deciding factor was the faith in which a man died. We cannot fully

[3] *Sum. Theol.*, pars. Ia, q.XXXII, art. 4; q.CII, art. 1; *cf.* Ia, q.I, art. 10.

understand the mediaeval philosophers if we allow ourselves to forget for one moment that they were bound down unescapably to premises of this kind; and this same consideration is equally necessary when we compare pre-Reformation with post-Reformation history. The medieval historian worked under conditions differing always, and sometimes differing with almost irresistible force, from those under which men had written history in classical times, or under which most men write history to-day. True, we can only say *most men* of to-day: the contrast is not altogether unqualified: for there are still three modern societies in which the historian has neither the freedom of antiquity, nor the freedom we generally associate with modern society. A number of British historians have lately consented to sign a memorial originating from Geneva, and protesting against the action of the Italian government in expelling all professors who refuse to take an oath to teach Fascism pure and simple. If it were felt to be of the least use to sign a similar protest against the compulsion laid upon professors in Soviet Russia, we would willingly sign that also. And, thirdly, we stand face to face with the Papal proclamation of 1899. Leo XIII, in his Encyclical of that date to the French bishops and clergy, while pressing upon them the study of history, added:

> 'Those who study it must never lose sight of the truth that history contains a collection of dogmatic facts which are binding on faith, and which no man is permitted to call in doubt.'

For good or for evil, that precept is as definitely medieval as Cardinal Manning's: it makes us understand clearly why Monsignor Duchesne, the greatest Roman Catholic historian of our generation, lived to see his masterpiece first forbidden in seminaries and then actually put on the Index; and, again, why his still greater predecessor, Döllinger, died excommunicate; and thirdly, why Döllinger's greatest pupil, Lord Acton, escaped the same fate only through his political and social importance, and in virtue of the diplomatic ambiguities with which he managed to hold Manning at arm's length when the Cardinal summoned him to surrender.

I cannot look upon it as a mere chance that, of these three societies which thus restrict the scholar's freedom in the study of history, one is by its very constitution mortally antagonistic

to Reformation principles, while the other two have remained practically untouched by Protestantism during all these centuries. Leo XIII's Encyclical is perfectly logical and consistent in its repudiation of that plea for an open mind in history which was implicit in the Reformation movement, however unfaithful many reformers may have been in their own implied principles. It was Leo XIII who proclaimed most emphatically to the world the almost inerrancy of St. Thomas Aquinas in philosophy; and his Encyclical stamps Roman Catholic historiography also with the hall-mark of the thirteenth century.

Let us look closely, then, into that spirit, in its relation to the world of to-day: the world which, as both friends and adversaries agree, is for good or for evil more definitely a product of the Reformation than of any other movement. I need hardly say that I do not for a moment invite you to condemn as outworn or false, without further thought, whatsoever clashes with our modern habits or thoughts. On the other hand, I do feel that comparison is one fundamental duty of the historian: that the story of men's past thoughts and actions has no real interest or use for us unless we distinguish them to some extent as good or bad, as models for imitation or as dangers to avoid. We see this at once when we take an extreme case like cannibalism. In this matter it is the natural shudder which lends colour to the story, if only the pleasant shudder of reflecting that we ourselves live in a non-cannibalistic society. And, again, although we may exonerate the individual cannibal to a great extent, or even pardon him completely when he consumes his own father as a traditional filial duty, yet in exonerating the individual we throw all the heavier onus upon the social institutions at whose behest he acts. It is, of course, thoroughly unhistorical to judge a thirteenth century man apart from the beliefs and emotions of the thirteenth century. But it is equally unhistorical to assume, as writers so often assume implicitly, that the medieval thinker, if he had lived to-day and could have made his choice between the medieval world and the world in which we live, would have preferred the former, and would therefore have thought or written or acted here among us in a fashion not very different from that which has handed him down to fame. St. Thomas' whole philosophy was coloured by an eschatology which few

theologians, of any Church whatever, would dare nowadays to preach with thirteenth century directness. And that same eschatology weighed with equal force upon the historians of his day and of the whole Middle Ages.

If the one aim of human life is salvation in the medieval sense—not only its ideal aim but its most severely practical aim—then everything must be kept strictly within the limitations imposed by this all-embracing, all-commanding Church. Nothing has any value compared with a man's faith at the last moment of his life; therefore everything must be done to encourage, and nothing must be permitted to discourage, those habits of mind which the hierarchy preached as the only road to salvation.

I do not mean that even the strictest saint was always absolutely consistent here; no man ever is. But certainly it did differentiate the medieval attitude towards fact from the modern; and, in some cases, it made an almost incredible difference. Somewhere about 850 A.D. Agnellus, Bishop of Ravenna, undertook to write a complete series of lives of his predecessors in that see. He was, for that time, a remarkable scholar: yet here is his own description of his historical methods. 'Where I have not found any history of any of these bishops, and have not been able by conversation with aged men, or inspection of the monuments, or from any other authentic source, to obtain information concerning them, in such a case, that there might not be a break in the series, I have composed the life *myself* with the help of God and the prayers of the brethren.'[4]

A not inconsiderable proportion of medieval history rests upon revelations of that kind; and, when we carry ourselves back to the mentality of that age, why should it not? As a modern apologist pleads, truth was sought in the Middle Ages for the sake of salvation: and

> 'if truth be sought for the sake of something else, why may it not also be sacrificed? A work of art is achieved by shaping the story for the drama's sake; and if we weave fiction to suit the end, why not weave fiction with fact! or still better, *see* the fact in such a guise as to suit the requirements of our purpose?'[5]

Much which passed as history in the later Middle Ages had begun simply as pious fairy-story. Duchesne confesses this

[4] Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, Vol. I, p. 446 (2nd Ed., p. 664).
[5] H. O. Taylor, *The Medieval Mind*, Vol. I, p. 79.

concerning that Donation of Constantine which Dante so bitterly deplored, though he shared the general belief of his time in its genuineness. It rested entirely upon a fable of Constantine's leprosy and his baptism by Pope Silvester I; a story which originated probably in Armenia, and which a Pope like Gregory I ignored as unworthy of notice. Yet this gross figment, and the forged Papal Decretals which were connected with it, were treated almost as respectfully as the Bible itself; the Archbishop of Canterbury, in his decree of 1408, makes no distinction of guilt between those who contradict the Bible or these Papal Decretals of which so many were barefaced forgeries. There is scarcely any great monastery whose chartulary does not contain several forged documents; and the University of Cambridge won one of its greatest privileges, in the fifteenth century, by producing in court a charter of the most impudent falsity, in which Honorius I confessed himself a grateful nursling of this Alma Mater who in fact was not born till six centuries after his death! For, though our antagonist, the Bishop of Ely, might have some means of verifying the date of Honorius, he had none of dating the foundation of the University. Oxford claimed Alfred as her founder; we, in retaliation, claimed Arthur or a still earlier mythical King Cantaber. Thus, as Professor Maitland said in his Ford Lectures at Oxford, the earliest of all inter-University contests was a lying-match.

For trustworthy documents were rare; and, in default of documents, even the critical spirit can do little. There was a great lack of science in the modern sense; society was far less settled, even at the best, than it has been in these later centuries; and, without some social stability, it is impossible to verify distant facts. Books were not so scarce as used to be believed a hundred years ago, but they were a good deal scarcer than many modern writers seem to assume. Even the greatest monasteries added slowly to their stores; and the Middle Ages seem never to have revived or rediscovered the simple system of multiplication which had been practised in ancient times, when one man dictated to a room full of scribes. The greatest historian of the Middle Ages proper would probably be, by general consent, Matthew Paris. Yet it is doubtful whether there ever existed half-a-dozen manuscripts of his Chronicles. In this dearth of

books, or of historians working scientifically upon such books as might have been available to a man of great courage and determination, almost anything was possible. The fable of Pope Joan, with which a prominent Jesuit has recently tried to belabour modern Protestantism, is in fact a story born and nursed in Roman Catholic circles, and first exploded by a Protestant.[6] Between 1080 and 1110 the story is twice told by two of the least untrustworthy chroniclers of the time, Marianus Scotus and Sigebert of Gemblours. Later authors of unimpeachable orthodoxy and great reputation told the story in greater detail, how this disguised woman was elected pope and accepted as such, until at last she died in childbirth. The legend passed current throughout the Middle Ages; it was quoted as evidence before the Council of Constance, and was tacitly accepted by three Popes. The first man who seriously set himself to explode it was the Protestant David Blondel in 1647; and it was killed outright in 1863 by Döllinger, the man who had studied history too well to find it possible to accept the Vatican Decree of Infallibility.

It was not till the Renaissance that real scientific history began. Marsilius of Padua, Dante's contemporary, did show remarkable critical acumen, and exploded the pseudo-Clementine Epistle by practically the same arguments which have since compelled the strictest Roman Catholics to acknowledge that forgery. But even Marsilius did not venture to repudiate the Forged Decretals, openly at any rate. A century later, however, even these were attacked by Laurentius Valla and Nicholas of Cusa independently: they also are now universally abandoned. But other conflicts were longer and less immediately decisive. We may see this best in the writings of Melchior Cano, about 1550 A.D. Cano was one of the most learned bishops at the Council of Trent, and has sometimes been compared even with St. Thomas Aquinas. He had acquired the modern habit of verifying references: and he was pained to find that those Greek testimonies, professedly from St. Cyril of Jerusalem, upon which St. Thomas Aquinas had put implicit trust, were not to be found in the actual works of that Saint. This was the more dis-

[6] The story may be found in Herzog-Hauck, *Realencyclopädie,* s.v. *Johanna*; more briefly in *Encyc. Brit.* s.v. *Joan.*

tressing since, as Cano confessed, it was precisely these missing passages upon which St. Thomas' conclusions were mainly built; conclusions which approached more nearly to the modern doctrine of Papal Infallibility than those of any other really great medieval thinker. Cano here found a partial consolation in the belief that heretics must have mutilated St. Cyril; an imagination which nobody supports nowadays. But there were other factors in orthodox history, even in Cano's time, for which he could not find such easy consolation. He was a very honest and courageous man; he saw plainly how greatly the hands of the Reformers were strengthened by the untenable absurdities still current in orthodox ecclesiastical history; and he liberated his soul in a long passage from which I have no time to quote here beyond a few sentences.[7]

> 'We ought perhaps to blush to find that certain Gentile historians have been more veracious than our own. . . . Many of ours [*nostri plerique*] are either slaves to partiality, or even deliberately invent so much that I am not only ashamed but disgusted at them; for I am convinced that these men not only have brought no profit to Christ's people, but verily much disadvantage . . . Those who have attempted to excite men's minds to the worship of the saints by false and lying writings, seem to me to have done nothing more than to destroy men's faith in the truth for the sake of this faith in falsehood; and the result is that even those things are doubted which have been published with strict accuracy by thoroughly veracious authors . . . Nor do I here excuse the writers of that book which is entitled *The Mirror of Examples*, nor even of that history which is called *The Golden Legend*. For in that book you may more often find monstrous distortions of miracles [*miraculorum monstra*] than true miracles. . . . Concerning Vincent of Beauvais and St. Antonio [Archbishop of Florence] I judge with more freedom; for each of those has taken less pains to ensure the truth and certainty of his descriptions, than to rake in everything whatsoever that he finds written in any book.'

Yet those two authors were, to the Middle Ages, standard authorities, comparable to the encyclopedias and the great semi-official coöperative histories of our own day. Theirs had been considerable achievements for their own time; Vincent and Antonio were among the most learned of medieval authors; but Cano saw that they could not stand comparison with what was beginning to be done by such unorthodox students as Calvin and such half-orthodox as Erasmus. And, at the very moment

[7] I have quoted them far more fully, with references, in *Romanism and Truth*, Vol. I, pp. *ff*. Cano's elder contemporary Vives, the friend of Erasmus, had already expressed more briefly much of the same disgust.

that Cano wrote, there was also at work one of the greatest of Protestant ecclesiastical historians, Flacius Illyricus.[8] He was a party man; that was almost inevitable in those days; but he was an honest partisan; and his infidelities to the rule of historical impartiality are so open as to lose much of their danger. It was he who conceived the whole work, realizing the supreme need for a vast, fully-documented history; he collected twelve collaborators; and he undertook most of the begging for funds, perhaps the hardest work of all. His narrow Lutheranism, with certain faults of temper, made him many enemies; he represented not so much the Protestant party as a party within the Protestants; his bitterest and falsest enemies were among his fellow-Reformers; he failed to get support from any Protestant prince or even from any free city except Lindau. If the printing press had not already become a great institution, securing some sort of profit to any book that the public needed, and producing enough copies to save it from destruction by the authorities, the work would have been quite impossible. Even as it was, after years of hard reading and patient collection of documents, through travel, through money, through secret diplomacy, and actually after the first volumes had triumphantly forced their way, Flacius himself lost his professorship and was driven from place to place. Eight years after the appearance of the first volume, he was at Strasbourg, with his wife and eight children, not knowing where he would find a roof for the coming winter. Eight years later again (1575) he died at Frankfurt under the care of the charitable superintendent of an orphanage. The thirteenth volume of the history was completed by a colleague; the last three were never written.[9]

The book was called *The Magdeburg Centuries*, devoting as it did one folio volume to each century of Christianity, and being begun by a committee at the one free city where the Reformers had then their own way, Magdeburg on the Elbe. Flacius recognized frankly that the work would not be definitive; he only set himself to blaze a new trail, and this he did with immediate and lasting effect. Even to-day the book is helpful for students who wish to follow up any particular subject. In spite

[8] His *Catalogue of Witnesses to the Truth* was completed in 1553.

[9] A. Jundt, *Les Centuries de Magdeburg*, 1883.

of its party purposes, it was accurate and critical beyond anything of the kind that had preceded it; and, whatever may be said against its errors or its bias, the same may be pleaded even more strongly, in my opinion, against its great rival, the *Ecclesiastical Annals* of Cardinal Baronius. For the Roman court saw that the *Centuries* called for a counter-blast; they entrusted this to their greatest scholar, and gave him ample facilities. Baronius's twelve volumes began to appear in 1588; like those of Flacius, they stop with the twelfth century; but they were continued by others after Baronius's death; and these, again, are still of very great assistance to scholars.

If time permitted, I would dwell at far greater length upon that which we have here come to, and which seems to me the main lesson; *viz.* that an age of controversy begets ages of comparative certitude and rest. We need not here pit Flacius and Baronius against each other on the grounds of honesty and accuracy and intelligence. Let us assume for the sake of argument that there is nothing to choose between them. But the one incontrovertible fact is that these two, in rivalry, have enabled us to arrive at a far wider comprehension and a far juster balance than was possible when Melchior Cano wrote. Let me remind you of Macaulay's dictum: no human wisdom ever went farther than that practical principle which even children may invent in sharing an apple: 'You cut, and I will choose,' or *vice versa*. We may here take St. Paul's words, *mutatis mutandis*: 'some indeed preach history even of envy and strife, and some also of good-will . . . What then? notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence or in truth, history is preached.' So that even Carlyle, who thought that we were mostly fools, had in practice enough belief in human nature to think it worth his while to give his own version of history for men to choose or reject as their reason commanded.

That, then, is what the Reformation has brought into history: liberty to choose or reject; the liberty with which Christ has made us free. The Protestant who turns his eyes away from whatever may shock him in history is personally more guilty before God, without doubt, than the Roman Catholic or Fascist or Bolshevik, who can plead that his principles overrule him. But let us remember always that, although the Protestant *may*

be frankly unhistorical, there are moments at which those others *must* be so. Without comparing the persons, we are bound in duty to compare the rival systems; since, if we can no longer believe our own to be the better, conscience demands that we should adopt the other. And, in comparing the systems, we are bound to take account of Christ's criterion, 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' The populations among which differences of opinion on these acutely opposed historical questions are most temperately expressed are the populations which have been most deeply influenced by the Reformation. I have had occasion elsewhere to emphasize certain facts which nobody has ventured to contest under cross-examination, and which prove that high authorities in the Roman Church still allow themselves liberties in history which would bring upon any Anglican bishop, if he did the same, immediate exposure and widespread disapproval within his own communion. The Protestants Foxe and Burnet and Froude, though their errors are comparatively venial, have found their sharpest critics among their fellow-Anglicans. No Protestant can repeat *mutatis mutandis* that terrible confession which was extorted from Newman: 'unless one doctored all one's facts [in history], one would be thought a bad Catholic.'[10] It is indeed our tactical weakness that we have nothing like Infallibility to plead; but that is also our strategical strength; for we have absolute freedom to admit error, and thus to purge our cause, little by little, of harmful accretions.

[10] *Life*, by Wilfrid Ward, Vol. I, p. 572. For apologetic attempts to explain this away, see the *Modern Churchman* for March, 1925; an article which I have reprinted as *Roman Catholic History* (Simpkin Marshall; *2s. 6d.*).

THE PRECURSORS OF THE REFORMATION

By the Rev. Canon E. W. Watson, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford.

JOHN Aubrey, the father of the study of English folk-lore, says repeatedly that the superstitions he describes had been extinguished not by the Reformation but by the Civil War. They had been familiar to him as a young man: when he wrote under Charles II they were but a memory. If the light of the new philosophy and of the new sciences of nature, penetrating without their conscious knowledge the minds of peasants, had this liberating effect, we must assume that the religious reformation of the preceding century was similarly progressive in its action. It had to destroy before it could reconstruct, and we cannot understand the Reformation unless we take account of the deep repugnance which the old ecclesiastical system had come to deserve, and the mere tolerance with which it was endured by those who were not minded to overthrow it.

That is a subject to which ample attention has been paid of late, and concerning which we are becoming better informed every year. I need not enter into details; but we shall do well to bear in mind that competent witnesses are of one mind concerning the decay, and that it is no evidence of hostile partisanship when scholars expose the facts. Often enough it is sorely against their will that they must state the truth. The great truth is that for two hundred and fifty years, to say the least, there had been a progressive deterioration in religious and intellectual life when the great reaction came. The thirteenth century, in spite of the faults that an untamed humanity must show, had been an age of growth; there had been advances in knowledge and in thought as well as in constitutional development. But it exhausted itself; after it there was but repetition and exaggeration till mankind was irritated into revolution. We may see it in the decay of the great scholastic schools. They were fertile till the end of the thirteenth century; Duns Scotus died in 1307. But

they could only repeat and exaggerate, and invent meaningless refinements which led to nothing. And finally the dominant philosophy, that of Scotus, became so repulsive that to this day the quietest of Scottish county towns is best known by the very inappropriate nickname which has passed from the most intelligent of its natives to the class of 'dunces.' For Scotus had the eminent merit of making the will and not the intelligence the centre of interest in his philosophy. But his followers, during their dominance towards the end of the Middle Ages, had exaggerated his methods to the pitch of absurdity, and in the hurricane of ridicule which was to explode medievalism Scotus was discredited beyond recovery. Not that he was more absurd than other scholastics, but that he had become through success the representative of the type. When Erasmus and his followers chose him for their butt, it was not through any tenderness for Aquinas; they picked out the most conspicuous adversary to receive their darts. The result was that the conservative party was forced to accept the rival system of St. Thomas. They had not foresight enough to see what a *damnosa hereditas* an official philosophy would be, and so they laid a novel burden on Western Christendom. It is true that, if they must have an authority, they could not have chosen better than they did. But we belong to those who are not concerned with their later development, and it is found that those of our members who are attracted to such modes of thought find their satisfaction less in the Thomism of the thirteenth century than in the robust exaggerations of the Counter-Reformation.

We are the heirs then of those who had rejected Scotism but had not accepted Thomism as its substitute. We are partners in their revolt. And this revolt extended to the whole working system of the Medieval Church, and was nowhere more emphatic than in regard to the use of masses. We must bear in mind that the rise of discontent was caused, or accompanied, by an extraordinary exaggeration in the practices which excited it. This is well illustrated in the will of the Lady Alice West (E.E.T.S., 1882, Furnivall's *Fifty Earliest English Wills*). The lady died in 1395, and in her will provided that £18 10*s*. should be spent on the saying of 4,400 masses within a fortnight of her death. The alliteration is curious, and seems to mark a certain unsettle-

ment of mind. For the sum allotted amounts to exactly a penny for each mass, while the current fee was fourpence. We may wonder whether the lady really expected that priests would be ready to fulfil her wish on such miserly terms. Was it not rather an example of that unreality which haunted medieval minds? They were always exaggerating, saying more than they meant, careless to verify their expectations or to measure their resources. They made great demands and laid down stringent rules because they knew that no strict fulfilment could be expected. Did Henry V expect that the 20,000 masses ordered by his will would be said? There is little reason to believe that they were; and the same may be said of countless prescriptions of the canon law, which were severe on paper because there was no expectation that they would be put in practice. And so the whole system forfeited respect. The wealthy Lord Mayor of London who was father to Dean Colet provided by his will for the saying of masses on a quite royal scale. He could afford it, and we must believe that his wish was carried out. No masses were mentioned in the will of his son, the founder of St. Paul's School, and such repugnance to an abuse was to extend, as we know, during the Reformation to many other aspects of the Eucharist.

In fact, this arithmetical valuation of the Sacrament had led to an utter degradation of priesthood. The mere priest had fallen so low that it was quite usual for the more prosperous clergy to remain in minor orders. Till the Restoration this survived in England to the extent that holders of cathedral preferments might be no more than deacons, the nearest approach to minor orders that we retained; and to this day College Statutes would be satisfied by a clerical fellow stopping at the same point. But to say mass a man must be a priest, and the demand was for numbers. To satisfy it the bishops ignored the canon law which required that either they, or another, should provide a title, a sufficient income, to the candidates. Nothing was done to furnish them with work; if they obtained accuracy under a resident incumbent the bishops did not think it necessary to license them until the time came when heresy was in the air. Many simply tramped about the country waiting for news of some rich man's death, when masses would be in demand. It did not matter how they were said; the priest who refused to correct his old *mumpsimus* to a new *sumpsimus* dates at the latest from the Renais-

sance. In 1551 Bishop Hooper visited his diocese of Gloucester, and his report was published in 1904 by Mr. James Gairdner. He examined the clergy, 311 in number, in elementary religious knowledge. He found that 171 could not repeat the Ten Commandments, that ten could not say the Lord's Prayer, that 27 did not know who was its Author; two said it was so called because the Lord King had commanded its use. Hooper must have had a grim satisfaction in showing how great were the difficulties in his path of reformation. For these were clergy whom he had inherited from the reign of Henry, and many were to hold their posts during that of Mary and even into the reign of Elizabeth. They held parochial positions, and may have been somewhat above the average of the Mass priests.

Such a clergy did not command respect; and on other grounds the whole body, from the Pope downwards, were little regarded. Even those who, like Gascoigne, thought that reform without revolution was possible, were unsparing in their condemnation. That is a topic on which we cannot enter; nor need we consider such causes of indignation as had weight on the Continent, but little influence, so far as we can tell, in England. Such was the abuse of indulgences which excited Wyclif's indignation. Certainly there was no indulgence here so notorious and so shamelessly pressed on the public, as that on behalf of St. Peter's which moved Luther and his Elector to wrath. It may be that the ordinary indulgences, which were the small change of religion, were so common that they excited little attention. I may mention that we have lately found in Christ Church a number of indulgences for Compostella which had been offered for sale along the Rhine, had found no market, and had been pasted together as wastepaper, after removal of the seals, to serve as cardboard for the binding of a volume of St. Augustine. The price of the indulgence was one-sixth of a ducat, and a ducat contained about as much gold as our half-sovereign. Gascoigne had said, in the fifteenth century, that they could be bought for fourpence or sixpence, so the price had risen when, somewhere in North-west Germany, this indulgence was put upon the market, early in the sixteenth century.

Turning now to the substitutes that were offered for a discredited system, we must first consider the scheme of Marsilius of Padua, published in his *Defensor Pacis* in 1324. That was

almost two centuries before the Reformation, but the book was no mere antiquarian curiosity; an English translation was printed for controversial purposes in 1535 by William Marshall, a struggling literary man who hoped for much more than he received of patronage from Thomas Cromwell. Marsilius like Dante was for the supremacy of the secular government as against the Pope. For him the one Divine authority was the community, which chooses its government, which may be vested in a person or in a board; as an Italian he preferred the latter. In either case this government is by Divine appointment supreme. The Church is concerned only with souls, in the interest not of the present but of the future life; the State may, or may not, at its discretion enforce any penalties which the Church thinks fit to propose that it should inflict on offenders. If the Church were a co-ordinate or superior authority, the Divine purpose of concord among mankind would be frustrated, as in fact it was in the fourteenth century. The old conflict between Pope and Emperor had been revived, and the Pope came out of it with much less success than such predecessors as Innocent III.

Marsilius assumes the absolute authority of Scripture as the basis of his religious system; he rejects the Canon Law which was the stronghold of the Papacy. We must remember that that law was of no immemorial antiquity. It only gained coherence and an increasing force from about the year 1050. In its position of authority he places the State, which has full control of Church and clergy. It has the Church's endowments at its disposal; as it happened, the Spiritual Franciscans, who preached the duty of absolute poverty for the clergy, were at daggers drawn with Pope John XXII, whose orthodoxy was doubtful in more respects than one, and this teaching of Marsilius was likely to win him their approval. The supreme government of the Church should be vested in General Councils, summoned by the states and needing to have their decisions confirmed by the states. By Divine ordinance there is but one rank of the clergy: distinctions among them, and above all the superiority of the Pope, are human devices for better administration. The learned editor of the *Defensor*, Dr. Previté-Orton, sums up the teaching of the author as 'an affection for his Presbyterian system, his Erastianism, and a passionate republicanism . . . bred in an Italian commune, hating the ecclesiastical powers which put it out of

gear, and anxious to combine the sharply bounded and compact unitary state which he loved with a kind of Society of Christendom guided by its elected advisory General Council.'

Within two years Marsilius was condemned by the Pope; but he, like the other leaders of the movement, ended his days in peace. Fifty years after the condemnation of Marsilius at Avignon, Wyclif was condemned by the same court, and as guilty of the same errors. Gregory XI denounced him as seeking to overthrow the status of the Church by teaching identical with that of Marsilius and John of Jandun, of cursed memory. John of Jandun had taken some part in the writing of the *Defensor* and had been, with Marsilius, a champion of the Emperor Lewis. Dr. Workman, in his admirable life of Wyclif, can find no evidence that he, or anyone else in England, had access to writings of Marsilius. But his ideas were in the air, and it is not strange that there is a striking resemblance between the teachings of the two. Both rest on the authority of Scripture. Wyclif habitually calls it the *Lex Dei*, and wrote a long work, *De veritate sacrae Scripturae*, which Dr. Workman describes as 'a rambling but uncompromising defence of the absolute inspiration and authority of the Bible.' In working out this problem Wyclif set an example which later reformers failed to follow. For them the authority of Scripture was an axiom which they accepted without discussion.

As to the substance of Wyclif's doctrine we must remember that he began with an attack on practical abuses, and that it was only when he found the champions of vested interests to be incorrigible that he turned, with a natural prejudice against them, to examine the theology which they maintained. It was not on theological grounds, but as the adversary of pluralists and 'possessioners' that his teaching had been condemned by Rome after denunciation by the English bishops. And when he turned to theology it was as a trained philosopher with a fixed realist conviction. Substances were created by God and therefore were permanent; it was false doctrine and false science to assert that God would, or could, destroy His own work and frustrate His own purpose by annihilating a substance; for instance, the substance of bread or of wine in the Sacrament. Of course there was the pride of the schoolman in all this, and the pleasure of routing, as he thought he was doing, fallacies which were moral

as well as intellectual. That is a controversy we may leave alone. But if we are to understand Wyclif's failure we must bear in mind his determinism and his individualism. Religion for him has the purpose of saving those particular souls who are to be saved. The Church is only a means to that end; it is not an end in itself, and is under the management of the State. Wyclif's theory of the State practically comes to Divine right vested in the King, for the King represents God. The Pope has no right over other bishops, for St. Peter had none over the other apostles. Though bishop and priest are really one order, the working system of the Church is to be respected so long as it is not abused. But abuses were sadly prevalent, as Chaucer or Piers Plowman and an infinity of other witnesses agree with Wyclif in showing; and when abuse prevailed obedience was no longer due. Least of all was reverence to be paid to the religious orders—the 'sects,' as Wyclif called them, for their claim to pre-eminence in the spiritual domain was contradicted by the facts; and Wyclif agreed with Cardinal Manning that the technically religious life was not higher than that of the secular clergy, provided the latter lived up to their vocation. And, to leave Wyclif, we may doubt whether his concentration of interest on the local Church of England was, at any rate in that generation, altogether helpful; and his insistence on the sole authority of the text Scripture was not found by Richard Hooker an adequate basis.

The movement started by Wyclif was not a failure. His 'Poor Preachers,' though we know nothing of their organization, certainly worked according to a system. One difficulty which Wesley had to meet did not exist in the fourteenth century; there were only too many priests available, and no provision had to be made for ordination. Their russet gowns must have been much like those of the Franciscans, and wandering religionists were too common to attract dangerous notice. And in an age which had no system of police the peril, apart from deliberate malevolence, could not be great. Informers are never popular, and the Preachers had many friends. But unfortunately they devoted too much of their eloquence to denunciation, and from time to time they anticipated the methods of Mr. Kensit. The attitude of the superior person, always correcting

the exercises of others, is not attractive, and this fault may have been the cause of the loss of moderate and educated adherents, which soon was manifest. It is impossible to doubt the sincerity of those who adhered, for the most part without much knowledge, to their master's teaching; but it would be unjust to accuse the majority of Wyclif's abler adherents of mere cowardice and ambition because, sooner or later, they abandoned his cause. Wyclif had found a grim satisfaction in the great schism, when the rival Popes called each other Antichrist. Both were right, he thought. But it was only humble folk, of very limited knowledge, that were likely to find satisfaction in a belief of which that tenet was a substantial part; for Wyclif seems to have failed to inspire his followers with the motives which have usually been the strength of revivalism. They were devout, they read their Bible or such parts of it as they possessed, they had a succession of martyrs which lasted till the early years of Henry VIII; and when Lutheranism reached England no one was surprised. It seemed a continuation of Lollardy.

The whole movement we have been considering was primarily a protest. Its strength, and its weakness, came from this fighting spirit. Its positive contribution to English religion was that it brought in the reading of the Bible as a primary duty and privilege, and that it made preaching popular. No more destructive blow to the old system was struck than that of Archbishop Arundel, when he not only limited preaching to men specially licensed, but also discouraged preaching generally. Even so conservative a divine as Thomas Gascoigne in his *Liber Veritatum* expressed his strong disapproval of such a policy. Preaching was desired by the orthodox to whom traditional observances were ceasing to appeal, as much as by those who tended to revolt. We remember how San Bernardina of Sieno, the great Franciscan revivalist of the fifteenth century, bade his hearers, if they had to choose between sermon and mass, to choose the sermon. Of this attraction Arundel deprived the Church, which no doubt he believed he was serving. That demand for preaching was, according to their measure, supplied by the Lollards. And this may explain a curious point in their history. No religious body with a considerable number of martyrs has had at the same time a greater number who forsook it

under pressure of persecution. It would be unjust to attribute this surrender to mere cowardice. I think we may better explain it by the attraction which the preaching exerted upon many who were not convinced adherents. They wanted preaching, and they found it in this quarter only. Or we may take the analogy of the Waldensians of Piedmont. It was not till missionaries from Geneva bade them make their protest unmistakeable that a practical toleration which they had enjoyed for some time came to an end, and serious persecution began. There may be, and often there is, sincerity under the form of compromise. We may doubt, however, how we should rank the discontent that was widely prevalent within the monasteries. Strype has told us how that stern Calvinist, Archbishop Whitgift, in the table-talk of his later life used to tell how he learned the principles of his maturity while he was being trained as a boy under his uncle the Abbot of Wellow, an Augustinian house now swallowed up in Great Grimsby. He must have been precocious, but that is just what Tudor children were. The discontent with which the abbeys were seething had taken, or was ready to take, doctrinal form.

There is one wide field, that of the devotional, poetical, mystical religion of the later Middle Ages, into which I cannot enter, except to say that it evidently had its share in working changes by making the conventional notions and practices uninteresting and unprofitable. How far our sense of the importance of this aspect has grown within a generation may be seen in Mr. W. W. Capes's *History of the English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*. That excellent book was published in 1900; it contains one cursory reference to Richard Rolle, and no mention whatever of Hilton or Juliana. They seemed to the author to stand outside the current of history, and to be irrelevant to his subject. Yet we can see how significant they were, and I think we may come to the conclusion that, just as the baser side of the religion of that day repelled serious minds, so its ordinary practice must have seemed flat and shallow to those who were inspired with higher spiritual thoughts and aims. But as yet the constructive was weaker than the destructive impulse. Men were more certain of what must be demolished than what should take its place.

THE RENAISSANCE IN RELATION TO THE REFORMATION

By V. J. K. Brook, M.A., Censor of St. Catherine's Society, Oxford, University Lecturer in Reformation Theology, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Lincoln, and Prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral.

IT would seem, at first sight, as though the writer of this paper had a very easy task. The Renaissance has been defined by Principal Lindsay as 'the blossoming and fructifying of the European intellectual life'; by J. A. Symonds as 'the emancipation of reason in a race of men intolerant of control.' What could, then, be more simple, more acceptable to Protestant self-esteem, than to suppose, without further question, that the Reformation was merely the application of reason to the system and outward forms of religion upheld by the Mediaeval Roman Church, and the consequent clearing away of superstitions no longer tolerable to man's re-awakened critical sense? There are few now who would deny that in mediaeval Christianity, whatever its great merits may have been, there was at least some superstition, a tendency to rely on the observances of religion rather than to insist on its inner spiritual core. Even Mr. Belloc has admitted that there was 'an exaggeration of routine and precise rule as opposed to latitude of movement . . . a preponderance of framework in the living organism as against the flesh and blood thereof' and, especially among the laity, 'a reliance upon the externals of religion at the expense of the spiritual life.' Naturally, we should expect that when the light of unfettered reason was turned onto ecclesiastical theory and practice, the Reformation would inevitably follow.

But History is seldom so logical as we expect: a very slight consideration of the facts shows that the relation between Renaissance and Reformation is not so simple and direct as has been suggested above. On the one hand, Luther, for example, though it is very easy to exaggerate and give a false impression of his simplicity and ignorance, was certainly not a typical child of the Renaissance. On the contrary, he had the profoundest

dislike of reason which, among other things, he calls a 'poisonous beast,' 'an ugly devil's bride,' 'God's bitterest enemy': to the end of his life he remained quite grossly superstitious, ready to imagine that any strange noise was the devil trying to get at him to carry him off. Plainly, though he had lived in the midst of the humanist movement at Erfurt, its centre in Germany, he was not in sympathy with it, or very seriously affected by it. Yet he was the real leader of reform, if that title may be given to any one man. And, on the other hand, when we look at the circles in which the Renaissance movement had most hold, they are not, strangely enough, centres of Protestant zeal. Although the new culture and devotion to art and letters had started in Italy at least a hundred years before Luther led his revolt, yet that country remained the stronghold of Catholicism. Indeed, so slight at first was the consciousness there of any clash between the new learning and the old religion that the dignitaries of the Church were often the most liberal patrons of the arts. The churches were beautified and the Church unperturbed. It was only well after the Reformation movement had obtained a firm hold that the new scientific theories of Copernicus and Galileo antagonised the ecclesiastical authorities in Italy. Again, even in the more austere regions of Northern Europe, where the Renaissance took especially the form of interest in learning rather than in art, the first great leaders of thought remained true to the Church of their birth. Later on, when the split between Roman and Protestant had come, it is true that the newer, more humanistic universities did side with Reform. But Colet, Erasmus, More, the so-called 'Oxford Reformers,' despite their criticisms of the Roman Church, yet remained members of it. Erasmus, in particular, venerated by his contemporaries as the greatest scholar and thinker of his day, steadily refused to throw in his lot with Luther. Though admitting the justice of some of his criticisms and hoping for a quiet, gradual reform of the abuses in the Roman Church as the new knowledge spread its influence, Erasmus strongly objected to the idea of breaking away from Rome, and even on one occasion urged that the Pope should silence Luther by mere authority. Later on, he and Luther quarrelled violently over the question of free-will. Thus in fact neither the most prominent early leaders of the new

learning joined the Protestant forces, nor was Luther in sympathy with the intellectual outlook and interests for which humanism stood.

None the less, in a very real sense the Renaissance was, if not the cause, yet a necessary pre-condition of the Reform movement. What it did was to undermine the basis on which rested the practically unchallenged authority of the mediaeval Church, and only when that had been done was the possibility of a break away from, or successful opposition to, that Church even thinkable. Of course, there had been previous attempts at reform; and the doubts and criticisms raised by Wyclif had not been by any means completely silenced when Luther began to revolt; nor was Wyclif alone in venturing to attack the official teaching of the Church of his day. But in the period before the Renaissance the Church was really too strong to have any need seriously to fear such agitations in Western Europe. Her teaching of man's fallen condition, and of his complete worthlessness, apart from such value as he received through the mediatorial actions of the Church, was almost universally accepted. Only by submission to her and dependence on her intercessions, not through any act of his own, could a man hope for salvation. Even the Nominalists, who more than others tried to find room in the circle of accepted theological ideas for value to be allowed to moral and spiritual worth in the individual, did not break from the Church, despite the novelty of their theories. No doubt, formally, really sincere repentance was allowed to avail much; but, as one of Luther's early teachers put it—a quotation I owe to Professor McKinnon's *Luther*—'very few indeed are truly contrite : therefore very few would be saved without the priests.' Man's hope of salvation, therefore, was thought to depend not on his own moral and spiritual endeavours, but on the mediatorial powers of the priesthood.

The general acceptance of that view gave to the Church tremendous power which, undoubtedly, she abused. That is a point about which I hope we shall agree : for there is no time to argue it here. It is really put beyond dispute by a remark of Erasmus, that in his day to call a layman 'monk' or 'cleric' was regarded as an unpardonable insult — so notoriously did such churchmen fail to win respect : while one writer in the Cam-

bridge Modern History thinks that the chief causes of the Reformation were economic—so overwhelming were ecclesiastical exactions, so galling to the laity the vast estates of the Church. Undoubtedly there was much discontent. Still, the Church was fairly safe so long as she was seriously regarded as in possession of 'the keys.' And for centuries that belief held the field almost unchallenged because the 'inspired' Church taught that it was so, and there was really no standing ground from which an opponent could attack the theory. For, roughly speaking, the established doctrine could only be attacked from one of three positions—on the basis either of reason and really scientific study of the world, or of the Bible, or of the Early Church—and none of those bases was available for the mediaeval critic. The Nominalists, it is true, had given fairly free rein to reason and had shown that often enough the dogmas of Scholasticism appeared to contradict the inferences which reason seemed to draw from practical experience. But it is very significant that, when such a disagreement appeared, they asserted that it was the teaching of the Church which was to be received, not that of practical reasoning. Nor could the teaching and practice of the mediaeval be checked by comparison with those of the primitive Church; there was little accurate knowledge of or interest in early church history, and what passed for historical documents were such forgeries as the Donation of Constantine or the Isidorian Decretals. Nor again could current tradition be effectively checked by accurate reference to the Bible in its true and original meaning. Very few knew Greek, still fewer Hebrew. Thus the text in general and official use was the Latin Vulgate which, in many places, by its phraseology appeared to give authoriy for ecclesiastical customs to which the original Greek or Hebrew had no reference. It was, for example, a revelation to Luther when he found that 'poenitentia' in the Vulgate did not originally mean, as he had always supposed, 'penance' with all its ecclesiastical associations, but was a translation of *μετανοία* and meant simply change of mind, with no ecclesiastical associations at all. But, further, the common folk had very little chance of knowing even the Vulgate version of the Bible, still less vernacular versions, before the invention of printing. Luther, for example, was nearly twenty before he first

handled a Bible in the University of Erfurt. The first printed German Bible did not appear till 1466; the first printed in English — and that only the New Testament — did not appear till 1526, and then had to be printed abroad and surreptitiously. Except, therefore, for those who had access to libraries and could read Latin, Christians in the main knew only those parts of Holy Scripture that were read in the services of the Church. For the rest they were dependent for their knowledge of Christianity on what the Church taught them.

Thus the position of the Church was very strong: nowhere was there any substantial foothold for her enemies. It was the Renaissance, with its new interest in real knowledge of fact and real history, its passion for antiquity, its textual criticism, and its higher estimate of man's powers and importance, which first really undermined this hitherto impregnable position of the Church. But it is vital to recognize that this came about, as it were, incidentally, not of deliberate purpose. The effect of the new interest in things of beauty, perhaps the earliest feature of the Renaissance, was to divert men's minds from the contemplation of the heavenly life, to which alone the Church had directed them, to the consideration of this world and of man's artistic achievements therein. If man could achieve such masterpieces, how could he be no more than dust and ashes, a worthless worm? Almost unconsciously, men began to have a higher opinion of themselves and of their value than the Church had allowed, and a greater confidence in their own powers, which before long issued in a new scientific view of the universe based on observation in place of the older view based on authoritative tradition. That, of course, in its fulness, really comes after the Reformation, but it is the outcome of a new confidence in experience as distinct from tradition, which did help from the first to loosen the hold of the Church. Moreover, not only did the stock of man go up—if I may use the phrase—involving a higher belief in the results of his experience and his reasoning processes, but also the stock of the Church went down. The study of classical antiquity, which was one of the passions of the scholars of the Renaissance, had serious effects. First-hand knowledge of Greek philosophy brought men into contact with some of the noblest and highest speculations of the human mind,

and the dryness and narrowness of scholastic systems were strikingly displayed by comparison. Even such a good churchman as Colet pours scorn on the scholastics, and dares to attack the Angelic Doctor himself—'if he had not been so very arrogant, he would not surely so rashly and proudly have taken upon himself to define all things.' It began to be felt that the traditions of the Church were not entirely beyond the criticism of reason; certainly that they were not all to be received without question.

Further, the passion for what was old led to the study and the printing of the early Fathers, so that the history and polity and faith of the early Church became easily available for all who sought to know them. On the other hand, the increased critical acumen gained by classical study soon brought the certainty that some of the documents on which pre-eminently the Roman claims rested were simply forgeries. Real knowledge of history and the primitve Church thus took its place as a very deadly weapon in the armoury of the critic of Rome.

Finally, this same scholarly sense soon began to find fault with the Vulgate, both for its style and for its failure accurately to reproduce the sense of the original. From it men began to turn to the Greek text, and the appearance of the first printed New Testament in Greek—that of Erasmus, about 1516—was a real turning-point. But, if I may stress the point once more, Erasmus' motive in producing it was that of the scholar, not of the ecclesiastic. He was not seeking to supply ammunition for the enemies of the Pope, but to print accurately what he believed was originally written.

However incidental these results of the new love of learning may have been, their effect was tremendous. The prestige and authority of the Church were very seriously threatened; and once that had taken place, she was very far from invulnerable. Perhaps the most striking symptom of this is the stream or ridicule which suddenly began to appear. Men began to feel themselves sufficiently free from the hold of the Church not merely to resist her claims where they seemed unjust, but to mock at her clergy and monks for their pedantic behaviour, their silly externalism and their failure to live up to their spiritual professions. In 1503, Erasmus put out a book in which he poured

scorn on some of the almost mythical persons who were supposed to be effective mediators on man's behalf in this or that sphere — Rochus who protected from plague, Appolonia who cured toothache, and so on. That sort of thing, he maintained, was not religion: on the contrary '"Love," says St. Paul, "is to edify your neighbour" . . . and if only this were done, nothing could be more joyous or more easy than the life of the religious' —a degree of simplification very dangerous to the contemporary Roman system. In 1511 appeared Erasmus' *Praise of Folly*— far the severest attack on the mediaeval Church which had yet been put out. He mocks at the problems of the scholastic theologians, he jeers at the worldliness of prominent ecclesiastics— 'those supreme pontiffs who stand in the place of Christ, if they should try to imitate His life, that is His poverty, His toil, His teaching . . . What could be more dreadful?'—because so many in Rome would starve! He is full of scorn for the monks and their mechanical rules — refusing to touch money except with glove on hand, making up for fasts by immoderate feasting, and so on; 'they do all things by rules,' he says, 'by a kind of sacred mathematics.' Now Erasmus, despite all that, remained a member of the Roman Church, with a real respect for the honest and devout monk, and a reverence for the Pope, to whom, in fact, he dedicated his Greek New Testament. But such language and attacks necessarily shook the hold of the Church over the minds even of simple, honest believers, to say nothing of the more learned.

Nor was Erasmus alone in such attacks. Very famous is a series of 'Letters of Obscure Men'—supposed to be from devout and simple believers, raising what seemed to them difficult points of conduct. Both the trifling character of the points at issue and the silliness of the supposed writers tended to emphasize very strongly the idea that within the Church it was only trifles which got serious consideration, and that those who tried to be really and fully orthodox and obedient were stupid and cramped and out of sympathy with the broader views of those who pursued the new learning.

Such attacks, especially when their authors firmly remained members of the Church, may seem to be of no very great significance—hardly more important than the violent attacks launched

from time to time on the Establishment by those who none the less continue to be ministers of the Established Church. In point of fact, however, they had a very wide circulation and seem to me to be one of the most telling of the contributions made by the Renaissance to the Reform movement, once they are observed in their proper setting.

When the learned world felt able to poke fun at the Church so broadly and with impunity, plainly the old unquestionable authority had gone. The Roman Church had to establish her position, and could no longer take it for granted. That, in a sense, seems a negative contribution, but it was an important one; for it did set free all the forces, bad as well as good, which hitherto had been restrained by the orderly and unquestioned rule of Mother Church. For, though the Church abused her powers, she did at least have some influence in checking abuse and riotous conduct in others. Once the fear of her authority was removed, there appeared such excesses as the Peasants' Revolt in Germany and the disorders and antinomianism favoured by the Anabaptists, which culminated in their efforts to form a Communistic State in Münster. The power whose domination had chiefly secured the peace and order and civilization of the Middle Ages to a large extent had lost its hold, thanks to the Renaissance.

But to say that, and to add that such a loosening of its hold was vital before any serious reform movement could take place, is quite different from finding in the Renaissance the positive urge which led to the movements of Luther and the Reformed Church. From anything that has been said hitherto, the only result for religion of the Renaissance might have been not a Reform movement, but the complete rejection of the Christian faith for which the Roman Church stood. That is not mere conjecture. There was actually a certain amount of sheer agnosticism among the intellectuals, and also of eagerness to escape from payments for Church purposes—ministerial salaries and the like—among others who had not really any serious intellectual doubts, but felt that the old sanctions for such payments had now gone. That out of the confusion of ideas and the shattering of traditions there arose new and positive Christian bodies separate from Rome and yet preserving (as they, at any

rate, believed) everything which was vital in Christianity was due not to the Renaissance at all, but to spiritual leaders who, with one possible exception, had little claim to be regarded as favourers of the new learning. Perhaps it is permissible to expand this point.

It will, I think, be generally agreed that Luther was the protagonist on the Protestant side. Now, he was not an ignorant peasant. He had been a monk for more than ten years before he posted his Theses in 1517. In his monastery he had assimilated much of the Nominalist teaching (some of which he accepted to the end), and had even been given the post of Lecturer on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, which shows that he had mastered the scholastic teaching. Part of his monastic life he had spent at the new University of Erfurt, where inevitably he came into contact with the new ideas which were spreading. Thus he was not ignorant. Nor was he without considerable powers of close reasoning—his long treatise against the Freedom of the Will is argued with all the logical skill of a scholastic. But it was neither logic nor academic learning nor new ideas which were at the basis of his revolt. It was a purely religious, spiritual movement. He had taken refuge in a monastery because he was overwhelmed by the sense of the danger of his sinful condition : in the monastery, his scruples were not satisfied by routine and confession, penance and absolution, but rather increased by constant self-examination and sense of failure. The one thing he craved was the knowledge of forgiveness, the secure assurance that, without any dependence on his own merit, his sins were forgiven. And that he found, not through reason, but in meditation on St. Paul and his doctrine of justification by faith. He came to share—not, I think, through any logical process, but rather by contemplation of the Cross—St. Paul's intense conviction, which nothing thereafter could shake, that through Christ and in Christ, no matter how sinful he was, he yet had peace with God. Such a faith may or may not be logically provable, but certainly it was not reached by logic : rather the faith came first, and any later theory of it was an attempt to explain it, not the reason for its inception. Thus at the back of the Lutheran movement there lay not the reasonableness and learning of the sixteenth century enlightenment, but the deep spiritual experience of a single man. He

knew, beyond all reason, that Christ had freed him from his sins: on that all else depended. Luther's own experience and conviction were almost the sole basis of Lutheranism: by them he tested Church customs and the like, by them he assessed even the degrees of value of the various books of the Bible, not by the rules of the textual critic. Moreover, in view of his conviction and his strength of character, I think it certain that Luther would ultimately have broken with Rome whether or not the Renaissance had already loosened her hold. At first, he does not seem to have realized that if salvation is by faith alone, then the whole of the Roman organization was largely beside the mark. Far from attacking it, at first he went quietly on with his monastic duties: even the Theses were not a declaration of war on the Pope, but suggestions for the improvement of the practice and teaching of the Church, especially with regard to Indulgences—suggestions which he seems honestly to have thought the Pope would accept. It was only when he found that the Roman Church would not allow that in which alone he had found peace, that he became reconciled to separation from it. His own inner convictions he would not deny: as he declared at the Diet of Worms: 'I neither can nor will take back anything, since to act against conscience is neither safe nor upright. Here I stand: I can no other. God help me.' When the Roman Church would not allow his teaching, he allowed himself to be put outside that Church. But it was his own conviction which consoled and strengthened him and on which, later on, he built: it was not the new learning or its fierce criticism. They, no doubt, made it easier for men to break away and follow the new light which was Luther: but they did not themselves kindle the light.

In Switzerland, again, the positive, constructive effect of the Renaissance in the matter of Church reform seems to be surprisingly slight. Here, it is true, the first voice raised against Rome was that of Zwingli, who was definitely identified with the movement of the new learning. The difference between his attitude to the old Church and Luther's is highly significant: Luther was furious that men who deeply needed the healing of their souls should be put off with externals: Zwingli ridiculed the system of the Church and scorned it, like a true rationalist. And in that which he sought to put in its place there was a large

measure of rationalism. The mystery of the sacraments very largely disappeared; the doctrine of God was treated from its philosophical rather than its religious aspect; there was a much higher conception of man's powers and value (a very humanistic touch) and religion assumed a moralistic form, with great stress on man's duty to carry out the divine law. In Zwinglianism, it seems to me, we have the nearest we ever get to a reformed pattern of Christianity positively promoted by the new thought of the Renaissance period—a religion in which reason rather than faith is the dominant element. But it is very striking that this form of religion, which one would have expected to be particularly acceptable to the sons of the Renaissance, in fact never made any wide appeal: it hardly survived its founder, and for practical purposes was swallowed up in the movement headed by Calvin who, for all his tremendous ability and real learning, was yet, as an original thinker, the inferior of Zwingli.

In a sense, Calvin belongs to the second generation of Reformers; for when he first came into real prominence the breach with Rome had already taken place both in Germany and Switzerland, and in England. No doubt he increased the extent of the breach, but he did not lead it, and his real importance is that, to quote Mr. Belloc, he gave 'consistency and form and therefore endurance' to those Churches which had broken away. In the *Institutes*, he provided a logical and consistent mould into which the rather inchoate and unfixed ferment of revolt could be moulded and so reduced to steady shape. What he did, says Mr. Belloc, was 'to produce a church, a creed, a discipline which could be set over against' the Roman Church. I have no desire in the least to belittle the importance of that; it simply had to be done if Protestantism was to survive at all, and the spread of the Reformed Church is a monument to the organizing capacity of Calvin. But the point which is significant for the purpose of this paper is this—that in the *Institutes* Calvin's guide and basis is not reason, and is not the early custom of the Church, and is not the light of inner conviction; it is simply the Bible, taken as equally and throughout the inspired word of God—and verbally inspired at that. He does not attack Rome because her practices are silly, but because they are un-Biblical; he does not suggest a new system of Church government and discipline because it is

reasonable, but because it is what the word of God demands. So that, here again, as in the Lutheran movement, the influence of the Renaissance was preparatory and negative rather than positive and constructive.

As we look back, it is possible, I hope without impertinence, to suggest that in both cases it has led to some weakness that Luther and Calvin were not more deeply affected by the true spirit of the Renaissance, which is the spirit of the modern world. In Luther, ultimately, everything is made to depend so much on his own experience that the sense of history and tradition is, one feels, unduly neglected. Therein lies the danger which seems to me to lie very near the heart of all Protestantism—the danger of sheer individualism in religion. If Luther was to be guided solely by his own inner light, is not the same true for each of us? Then where is there any unity or authority or objective truth? That way confusion—or at least a very real likelihood of confusion—lies. In Calvinism, the danger lies the other way: it is the religion of a book, and the book cannot be re-edited, or expanded, and is supposed to supply its own static explanation. There is no room there for the voice of any living authority to meet the new problems of later ages. Besides, in view of the greater knowledge we have of the way in which the Bible was written, it is difficult for the modern man, however great his respect for the real genius of Calvin, to accept wholeheartedly the Biblical position he takes up. And in each case, the weakness lies in the failure to appreciate the authority of antiquity and of history—which was just the one thing Luther and Calvin might have learned from contemporary scholarship.

I hope it may not seem unduly complacent if I suggest that in England we have been more fortunate, largely because the formulation of Anglican views was not fully undertaken until the hold of the new learning on our leaders was more complete. It is a common-place that, under Henry VIII, although there was a breach with Rome, there was very little further break with mediaeval practice and tradition. No doubt there were many who wished to go much further, but the autocratic King prevented it, insisting on confession, transubstantiation, clerical celibacy, and so on. For a time under Edward VI, the extreme party of Reform began to get control, but the process was inter-

rupted by the reign of Mary, so that the English settlement did not really take place till the reign of Elizabeth. But by that time, the leaders were men of sound learning as well as spiritual insight. Few things are more impressive, for example, than the massive scholarship and judicious spirit of Jewel. The extent to which he has the early Fathers at his fingers' ends is astounding and (to be quite frank) at times overwhelming. But the result was salutary. There was a real sense of the importance and authority of history, and a judicial rather than a merely partisan spirit. There is all the reverence for the Bible which Calvin could desire, but side by side with it the appreciation that the New Testament can only be understood in the context of the early history of the Church, and that that history and the custom of the primitive Church are the necessary commentary for the proper understanding of the New Testament. Thus, in his Challenge sermon and in dispute with Harding, the criterion which Jewel takes is not simply the 'inner light,' nor the Bible, but the first six hundred years of Church history. Similarly, the authority of the living Church to initiate, and even to change, is insisted on by Whitgift when he tells Cartwright that it is a 'false principle and rotten pillar' to suppose 'that we must of necessity have the same kind of government that was in the Apostles' time,' for that certain points in government, etc., are 'left to the discretion and liberty of the Church,' a view which found firm expression in Article XX (though not without some difficulty) and Article XXIV. It was by that sense of the living authority of the Church that Anglicanism was, in part at least, saved from the dangers of sheer individualism and of being completely tied to a static form of religion. And that sense was due to the immense scholarship of the English Reformers and so, ultimately, to the spirit which found expression in the Renaissance.

THE REFORMATION AND THE SCRIPTURES

By The Venerable J. W. Hunkin, M.C., O.B.E., D.D.,
Archdeacon of Coventry.

I.

NO one can study the history of the Reformation without perceiving how much the movement owed at every turn to fresh first-hand study of the Bible. In the Middle Ages, though the authority of Holy Scripture was theoretically recognized, Bible study was in practice very largely left to expert theologians, who used the text of the Vulgate chiefly to support the traditional usages and doctrines of the Church. Four senses were to be looked for: the literal, the allegorical, the anagogical and the tropological. Thus St. Thomas Aquinas tells us that the words 'Let there be light' may mean literally an act of creation; allegorically, 'Let Christ be love'; anagogically, 'May we be led by Christ to glory'; and tropologically, 'May we be mentally illumined by Christ.' Similarly the word 'Jerusalem' might stand for a city, for a faithful soul, for the Church militant, or for the Church triumphant.[1]

It is no wonder that the results of a study of Holy Scripture by such methods were somewhat unremunerative. St. Thomas himself, for instance, bases his commentary of 700 pages on St. Paul's Epistles on the phrase '*a chosen vessel*,' and he arrives at the conclusion that all the fourteen Epistles (for he includes as Pauline the Epistle to the Hebrews) treat of grace, and that the Epistle to the Galatians 'is a sort of appendix to the treatment of grace as it is in the Sacraments.'[2] The Dominicans greeted this extraordinary travesty with enthusiasm, and circulated a story that St. Paul himself had appeared to St. Thomas and told him that no one had understood his Epistles so well as he.[3]

If such were the approved methods and results of Bible study, it is not altogether surprising that the authorities dis-

[1] F. W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation*, p. 295.
[2] F. W. Farrar, *op. cit.*, p. 271. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 313.

couraged the reading of Scripture by ordinary people who could hardly be expected to be so clever in handling it. Nor, in point of fact, on the eve of the Reformation, was Holy Scripture to any great extent a subject of study at the Universities. 'It is scarcely thirty years ago,' says Erasmus in writing (31st August, 1516) to Henry Bullock, of Queens' College, 'when all that was taught in the University of Cambridge was Alexander (*i.e.* a text-book on grammar), the Little Logicals as they call them (*i.e.* a text-book on logic), and those old exercises out of Aristotle, and *quaestiones* taken from Duns Scotus.'[4]

It was quite a new thing when at Oxford in the autumn of 1496 John Colet began to lecture on St. Paul's Epistles with the sole object of bringing out the plain meaning which the apostle intended to convey to those to whom he wrote.[5] One of the hearers of Colet's lectures less than two years later was the already distinguished Erasmus, who had come to Oxford to learn or, at all events, to improve his Greek.

Some thirteen years later, in the October term of 1511, Erasmus began, as Gibbon said, to teach at Cambridge the Greek he had acquired or, at least, improved at Oxford. He was appointed to the recently founded Lady Margaret Professorship, and though few pupils came to his Greek classes we may picture him 'toiling away in his chamber high up in the south-west tower of Queens' College,'[6] preparing his edition of the New Testament in Greek, the *Novum Instrumentum*, published at Basle in 1516. The work was eagerly welcomed by his friends in Cambridge, and by all who pursued the New Learning. The dedication of the volume had been accepted by the Pope himself (Leo X). The Conservatives, however, wedded as they were to the Old Learning rather than the New, were alarmed, and considerable controversy arose both at Cambridge and at Oxford.

By 1519, the year in which the second edition of the Greek Testament appeared, opposition in Oxford had risen to such a height that Sir Thomas More addressed a letter (29th March, 1519) to the authorities of the University setting out the claims and advantages of the study of Greek. 'At Cambridge,' he says,

[4] Quoted by J. B. Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge I*, p. 515.
[5] Seebohm, *The Oxford Reformers*, pp. 1 *ff*.
[6] Mullinger, *op. cit.* I, p. 495.

'which you were always wont to outshine, even those who do not learn Greek are so far actuated by a common zeal for their University, that, to their credit be it told, they contribute to the salary of the Greek professor."[7]

The Greek professor, in question, was no other than Richard Croke, of Eton and King's, who, after seven years on the Continent, had returned to Cambridge with a European reputation. In the course of the inaugural oration which he delivered in July he said: 'The Oxford men, whom up to the present time ye have outstripped in every department of knowledge, are betaking themselves to Greek in good earnest. They watch by night, suffer heat and cold, and leave no stone unturned, to make this knowledge all their own. And if that should come to pass, there will be an end of your renown . . . Nay, still further, I solemnly assure you, gentlemen of Cambridge, that the Oxonians themselves have solicited me with the offer of a handsome salary besides my maintenance. But feelings of respectful loyalty towards this University—and especially towards that most noble society of scholars, King's College, to which I owe my first acquirements in the art of eloquence—have enjoined that I should first offer my services to you. Should these services find favour in your eyes, I shall esteem myself amply rewarded; and I shall conclude that such is the case, if I see you applying yourselves to the studies which I advise. To imitate what we admire—such is the rule of life."[8]

The appeal of the Professor did not fall on deaf ears. In point of fact a number of the younger men in Cambridge had been earnestly devoting their attention to the New Testament ever since the publication of the first edition of Erasmus (1516), if not before. Among them were Thomas Cranmer, Fellow of Jesus, Thomas Bilney—'Little Bilney' as he was called from his very diminutive stature, of Trinity Hall—and Nicholas Ridley, then undergraduate, afterwards Fellow, and, later still, Master of Pembroke College. In one of the farewell letters written by Ridley at Oxford in October 1555, after his condemnation and before his martyrdom, he refers to his studies at Cambridge.

[7] Mullinger, *op. cit.* I, p. 526.
[8] Mullinger, *op. cit.* I, pp. 534, 535.

'Farewell, Pembroke Hall,' he writes, 'of late mine own college, my cure and my charge! What case thou are in now, God knoweth, I know not well. Thou wast ever named sithens[9] I knew thee (which is now a thirty years ago) to be studious, well learned, and a great setter forth of Christ's gospel and of God's true word: so I found thee, and, blessed be God! so I left thee indeed. Woe is me for thee, mine own dear college, if ever thou suffer thyself by any means to be brought from that trade. In thy orchard (the walls, butts, and trees, if they could speak, would bear me witness) I learned without book almost all Paul's epistles, yea and, I ween, all the canonical epistles, save only the Apocalypse. Of which study, although in time a great part did depart from me, yet the sweet smell thereof, I trust, I shall carry with me into heaven: for the profit thereof I think I have felt in all my lifetime ever after; and I ween, of late (whether they abide there now or no I cannot tell), there was that did the like. The Lord grant, that this zeal and love toward that part of God's word, which is a key and a true commentary to all Holy Scripture, may abide in that college, so long as the world shall endure.'[10]

II.

In the meantime a more revolutionary movement had been developing in Germany. Martin Luther, a young graduate at Erfurt, intended for the Law, had suddenly, to the disappointment of his father, entered the convent of the Augustinian Eremites. He entered it not so much to study theology as to save his soul, for he doubted whether he could ever do what he believed had to be done to save it if he remained in the world.[11] His earnestness and genuine piety, combined with his diligence in his studies, greatly pleased his superiors, and in 1508 he, with a few other monks, was sent to the Black Monastery at Wittenberg to assist the new University recently founded by Frederick the Wise, Elector of Saxony (1502). Here in the winter of 1512—1513 the enlightenment which was to change his whole life came to him while he was meditating on the Epistle to the Romans, particularly on i, 16-17. He saw that the

[9] Since.

[10] *The Works of Bishop Ridley* (ed. Parker Soc.), pp. 406, 407.

[11] T. M. Lindsay, *A History of the Reformation I*, pp. 199, 200.

righteousness of God spoken of in this passage was to be understood as the righteousness which God graciously gives or imputes to the sinner and which the sinner receives by faith. This conception at once appeared in his lectures on the Psalms (1513—1515), and was elaborated in those on the Epistle to the Romans (1515—1516). By this time he was becoming a power in Wittenberg both as a preacher and as a teacher, and when on All Saints' Day in the following year (1517) he nailed his Ninety-five Theses on the door of All Saints' Church, the University Church, the effect was electric. According to the usage of the times, these Theses were offered merely as subjects of debate, and their author was not supposed to be definitely committed to the opinions expressed.[12] The Theses, however, differed, as Professor Lindsay has pointed out, from most programmes of academic discussions in this, that everyone wanted to read them. The University press could not throw off copies fast enough to meet the demand which came from all parts of Germany, and the sales of Indulgences almost stopped.

The truth is that the time was just ripe for such a stand against ecclesiastical abuses. In German religious life there had long been a strain of simple evangelical piety which had nourished itself on prayer, practical charity and Bible reading. Twenty-two editions of the Psalter in German had appeared before 1509, and twenty-five of the Gospels and Epistles before 1518. Between fifteen and twenty versions of the whole Bible in High or Low German were printed during the last decades of the fifteenth and the earlier decades of the sixteenth century, all, of course, translations from the Vulgate.[13]

Luther's colleagues at Wittenberg were with him, and very soon he knew that his supporters were to be numbered by thousands. When he went for his famous disputation with Dr. John Eck at Leipzig in June 1519, the young Duke Barnim, Rector of the University, and several other members of the staff accompanied him, and two hundred of the students in helmets and halberts formed a guard. Next year saw the publication of the three writings which are commonly known in Germany as the *Three Great Reformation Treatises*. The first was an appeal *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* (August 1520):

[12] *Op. cit.* I, p. 215. [13] T. M. Lindsay, *op. cit.* I, p. 149.

and the last, published in October 1520, has for preface a short letter to the Pope (Leo X) and is entitled *The Liberty of a Christian Man.*[14] It will be sufficient for our purpose to note what Luther has to say directly bearing on Holy Scripture. *The Liberty of a Christian Man* maintains the priesthood of all believers, and lays it down that the soul of man needs absolutely nothing in the last resort but the word of God dwelling in him.[15] In the appeal *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* Luther asks if it were true that *the Pope alone could interpret Scripture*, where would be the need of Holy Scripture at all? Nay, 'Holy Scripture is open to all, and can be interpreted by all true believers who have the mind of Christ and approach the word of God humbly seeking enlightenment.'[16]

We need follow Luther's career no further than the Diet of Worms. After publicly burning the Pope's Bull on 10th December, 1520, he made his great speech before the Emperor at Worms on Thursday, 18th April, 1521, and nailed his colours to the mast with the famous declaration: 'It is impossible for me to recant unless I am proved to be in the wrong by the testimony of Scripture or by evident reasoning; I cannot trust either the decisions of Councils or of Popes, for it is plain that they have not only erred, but have contradicted each other. I am held fast by the Scriptures adduced by me, my conscience is taken captive by God's Word, and I neither can nor will revoke anything, seeing it is neither safe nor honest to act against one's conscience. God help me. Amen.'

Before the end of the following year with the assistance of Melanchthon and other friends Luther published a new translation of the New Testament (21st September, 1522).[17]

Meanwhile yet another movement for reformation had been more or less independently set on foot in Switzerland, and under

[14] The third was *On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church.*

[15] T. M. Lindsay, *op. cit.* I, p. 241.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 244. *Cf.* also Luther's well-known saying, quoted by C. Beard, *The Reformation*, p. 124: 'It belongs to each and every Christian to know and to judge of doctrine, and belongs in such wise that he is *anathema* who shall have diminished his sight by a single hair.'

[17] It went through sixteen revised editions and more than fifty reimpressions before 1534. The translation of the Old Testament, the work of a group of scholars at Wittenberg, was published in instalments, and then in complete form in 1534.

Huldreich Zwingli two of the strongest cantons, Zurich and Berne, were in revolt from the Pope. We need not here investigate this movement further than to observe that Zwingli, who in 1518 had protested against Indulgences, on January 1st in the following year preached the first of his sermons in Zurich—sermons based on the study of Scripture (and especially the Epistles of St. Paul) according to the principles of the New Learning, and making a clear distinction between Biblical and Papist Christianity.

So much at the moment for Luther and Zwingli. Philip Melanchthon's attitude to the Bible was exactly similar to theirs. In 1518 he had delivered an oration to the University of Wittenberg, *De Studiis Corrigendis*, in which he traced the progress of learning from the fall of the Empire up to his own day, and showed how the newly-discovered mines of antiquity subserved the study of the Scriptures.[18] John Calvin, of course, did not appear on the scene till later. He was born in 1509 and joined the Reformation in Paris in 1533.

III.

Let us return to England and to Cambridge and follow a little further the fortunes of 'Little Bilney' at Trinity Hall. He was a quaint, earnest little person, 'a very simple good soul,' Latimer afterwards called him,[19] 'nothing fit or meet for this wretched world,' an indefatigable student with a strange aversion to music. The rooms underneath his at Trinity Hall were for a time occupied by Thirleby, afterwards Bishop of Ely, who was particularly fond of playing on his recorder; and whenever he began Bilney, we are told,[20] forthwith betook himself to prayer as if assailed by some evil spirit. However that may be, Bilney himself describes the long trouble he was in about his soul and the little help he got from 'unlearned hearers of confession' who appointed him 'fastings, watching, buying of pardons, and masses.' 'But at the last,' he says,[21] 'I hearde speake of Jesus, even then when the New Testament was first set forth by Erasmus. Which when I understood to be eloquently done

[18] J. B. Mullinger, *op. cit.* I, p. 538. [19] Mullinger, *op. cit.*, p. 562.
[20] By Foxe: Mullinger, *op. cit.* I, p. 560.
[21] In a letter to Tunstal, quoted Mullinger, *op. cit.* I, pp. 556, 561.

by him, being allured rather for the Latine than for the word of God (for at that time I knew not what it meant), I bought it, even by the providence of God, and I doe now wel understand and perceive.'

Bilney soon became the leading spirit of a little group which met in the White Horse Inn (near the present site of the Bull Hotel) to study the Scriptures and the writings of Luther. Thither came Robert Barnes, Prior of the Augustinian friars at Cambridge, whose lectures both on the Latin Classics and on the Pauline Epistles had created a great impression in the University. 'Surely he is alone in handling a piece of Scripture,' wrote Latimer to Cromwell afterwards, 'and in setting forth of Christ he hath no fellow.'[22] Thither came also John Rogers from Pembroke (who 'broke the ice' as martyr in Queen Mary's reign), Nicholas Shaxton, President of Gonville Hall, and afterwards Bishop of Sarum, and many others. 'So oft,' said one of the youngest of the number, as in after years he looked back upon those gatherings, 'as I was in the company of these brethren, methought I was quietly placed in the new glorious Jerusalem.'[23] A little later the group were joined by Hugh Latimer who, under Bilney's influence, in the earlier part of the year 1524 'began,' as he says,[24] 'to smell the Word of God, and forsook the school-doctors and such fooleries.' Latimer was then about forty, a Fellow of Clare, and Cross-bearer to the University. He had at one time been a champion of the Old Learning against the New, and, when keeping his 'act' for the degree of bachelor of divinity only a few months previously, had attacked the principles advocated by Melanchthon. It caused quite a stir in the University when it was known that he had gone over to the 'Germans,' as the group at the White Horse Inn were nicknamed. Naturally the new movement was frowned at in many quarters. The most eminent advocates of the New Learning in England were very suspicious of Luther, especially after he had burned the Pope's bull (10th December, 1520). Luther's three treatises already mentioned were publicly burned at St. Paul's Cross on 12th May, 1521, when Bishop Fisher, Chancellor of Cambridge University and himself a generous supporter of the New Learning, preached a sermon

[22] Mullinger, *op. cit.* I, p. 567. [23] *Ibid.*, p. 574. [24] *Ibid.*, p. 582.

against the Reformer in which he declared that Luther in burning the Pope's bull had clearly shown that he would have burnt the Pope too had he been able. 'The saying was not forgotten; and a few years after, when (1526) Tyndale's New Testament was treated in like fashion, the translator caustically observed that the bishops in burning Christ's word had of course shown that they would willingly have also burnt its Divine Author.'[25]

Before the Easter Term of 1521 was over similar conflagrations had taken place both at Oxford and Cambridge. It is not surprising that both Barnes and Latimer soon got into trouble with the authorities, the one with the University, and the other with the Bishop of Ely. Barnes rashly ventured some sarcastic allusions to the great Cardinal Wolsey, and had eventually to fly to Germany. Latimer was more discreet, and when the Bishop of Ely, Nicholas West, inhibited him from preaching and he was finally cross-examined by Wolsey, the Cardinal took his side. 'If the Bishop of Ely cannot abide such doctrine as you have here repeated,' he said at last, 'you shall have *my* licence, and shall preach it unto his beard, let him say what he will.'[26]

All this time Thomas Cranmer was working away quietly at Jesus, lecturing and examining in Divinity and trying to raise the standard of Biblical knowledge by requiring of the candidates for divinity degrees some evidence of their having studied the Scriptures,[27] but taking no active part in the controversies of the time. His turn came later. On 30th March 1533 he was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, and at once he set out to meet what, in his eyes, and in the eyes of most reforming Churchmen, was one of the pressing needs of the moment, *viz.* the revival of Scriptural knowledge among both clergy and laity.[28] In 1534 he persuaded Convocation to petition for an authorized version of the Bible in English. To cut a long story short, in 1538 King Henry's Vicar-General, Thomas Cromwell, the Archbishop's friend and ally, issued Injunctions ordering that a copy of the Bible 'of the largest volume' should be set up in every church; and the clergy were 'expressly to provoke,

[25] Mullinger, *op. cit.* I, p. 571.

[26] Mullinger, *op. cit.* I, p. 584.

[27] A. F. Pollard, *Thomas Cranmer*, p. 20.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 94.

stir, and expect every person to read the same,' but to avoid contention and altercation and to reserve disputed points for 'men of higher judgment in Scripture.' The translation so authorized was, as regards the New Testament and the Old Testament from *Genesis* to II *Chronicles*, substantially the work of William Tyndale; the rest was Coverdale's. Tyndale's New Testament, which had been condemned and burnt at St. Paul's Cross twelve years before, thus at last came to its own, and has in point of fact permeated all subsequent versions of the Bible in English.[29]

Earlier in the same year the Ten Articles penned by King Henry himself, revised by Cranmer, and agreed upon by Convocation, laid it down that the Bible and the three Creeds were to be regarded as the standard of orthodoxy, 'a position,' says Professor Pollard, 'from which the Reformed Church of England has never varied':[30] but we must add that the eighth of the Thirty-nine Articles, which have now so long replaced all earlier drafts, makes it clear that the authority of the Creeds is derivative and dependent on that of Scripture: 'The Three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture.'

Of course the English Bible, although now sufficiently authorized, did not escape attack. The attack was led by Bishop Gardiner and was taken up by various clerics and laymen, out of sympathy with the reforming movement. A divine named Serles, for example, is reported as saying that as Adam was expelled from Paradise for meddling with the tree of Knowledge, so we, for meddling with the Scripture: while a young layman is alleged to have asserted that 'the Bible was made by the Devil.'[31] Later on the insurgents in the Western rebellion of 1549 suggested a further reason for the suppression of the English Scriptures. Otherwise, they urged, the clergy would not be able to confound the heretics! That is to say the illiterate priests who were fomenting the rebellion wanted protection from the results of their own illiteracy.[32]

[29] A. F. Pollard, *op. cit.*, p. 113.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 104.
[31] E. F. Pollard, *op. cit.*, p. 146.
[32] E. F. Pollard, *op. cit.*, p. 250.

In concluding this brief historical survey of the use made by the Reformers of Holy Scripture some reference should be made to John Wycliffe. As Professor Pollard has pointed out, 'The extraordinary parallelism between Wycliffe's ideas and the English Reformation is often neglected' . . . 'It must not be forgotten that the English Church in the sixteenth century assimilated little that had not been taught by Wycliffe.'[33] Particularly must we observe that Wycliffe seems to have been the first great Churchman to realize that the surest way to effect the reformation of a corrupt Church is to promote first-hand knowledge of the Scriptures.

IV.

It will perhaps be sufficiently clear from the foregoing sketch that the Reformers did not all approach the study of Holy Scripture in the same temper or frame of mind. Some, like Martin Luther and Thomas Bilney, were seeking peace, '*peace with God*,' and when they found it, generally through St. Paul's Epistles, they went on to search the rest of Scripture *for what was really there*: not for what ecclesiastical writers had presumed to read into the text. *What was really there* could be discovered, they held, by means of sound scholarship and close study, conducted prayerfully and under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, which would not be withheld from any sincere and earnest seeker. And *what is really there* in Holy Scripture is self-authenticating.

Other Reformers, like Erasmus, Zwingli and Thomas Cranmer, took a more intellectual path. Every mediaeval theologian had declared that the whole doctrine and system of his Church was based upon the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.[34] 'Well, then,' said Erasmus in effect, 'back to the original authorities and see *what is really there*.'* And the Reformers found, as they could not but find, in the pages of the New Testament an altogether simpler system of Christianity than that offered by the Pope. 'The dissonance between the Scriptures and the Papacy'[35] only became clearer and clearer the more they studied.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 270.
[34] T. M. Lindsay, *op. cit.* I, p. 454.
* Cf. L. E. Binns, *Erasmus the Reformer*, p. 74.
[35] E. F. Pollard, *op. cit.*, p. 228.

As early as 1525 Cranmer had begun in private to pray, he tells us, for the abolition of Papal power in England;[36] while in one of his most notable sermons in St. Paul's Churchyard (February 1536) he sought to prove that the Scriptural passages about Antichrist referred to the Italian pontiff, 'and of the two hours that he preached one and a half were occupied, so an unfriendly report ran, 'with blasphemies against His Holiness and his predecessors.'[37] To Cranmer indeed Holy Scripture was, perhaps above all, the *Sword of the Spirit* with which he had to attack both the Papacy itself and all the abuses which had crept into the Western Church. Thus in 1537 he wrote to a Kentish magistrate: 'If men will indifferently read these late declarations,[38] they shall well perceive that purgatory, pilgrimages, praying to saints, images, holy bread, holy water, holy days, merits, works, ceremony, and such other be not restored to their late accustomed abuses; but shall evidently perceive that the word of God hath gotten the upper hand of them all.'[39]

Similarly Latimer: 'I have read over of late the New Testament three or four times deliberately; yet can I not find there neither the popish consecration, nor yet their transubstantiation, nor their oblation, nor their adoration, which be the very sinews and marrow bones of the mass.'[40]

Reformers like Cranmer, then, used Holy Scripture as their chief weapon in the struggle with the Papacy. And it was a very effective weapon, for their opponents, until the Council of Trent, admitted (as has already been stated) that the whole doctrine and system of the Church was based on Holy Scripture. At the Council of Trent they endeavoured to turn the edge of the weapon by formally bracketing the written books of Scripture with '*the unwritten traditions* which, received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even to us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand.'[41]

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 101.

[38] i.e. *The Ten Articles* and *The Institution of a Christian Man.*

[39] Quoted E. F. Pollard, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

[40] *Conferences between Nicholas Ridley and Hugh Latimer during the time of their imprisonment* (published 1556). Latimer adds: 'But our nobility will not see: they will not have that religion that hath the cross annexed to it.' *Works of Bishop Ridley* (ed. Parker Soc.), pp. 112, 113.

[41] From the decree passed in April, 1546. Gibson, *Thirty-nine Articles*, pp. 235*f*.

Cranmer and his friends were too busy wielding the sword of the Bible to pay much attention to the notches in its edge. Cranmer himself seems to have been happily blind to the difficulties presented by the text of the Scriptures.[42] In this respect he was less acute or less frank than Erasmus, Calvin, Luther and others, especially Luther's friend, Andrew Carlstadt, who took part with him in the Leipzig Disputation of June 1519.

Erasmus did not deny the possibility of trivial errors and discrepancies in the New Testament.[43] Similarly Calvin makes no attempt to defend what he regards as an oversight or mistake in the sacred writers.[44] Luther's sturdy independence is well known. He perceived that 'the Books of Kings were a thousand paces ahead of Chronicles and more to be believed.'* He considered that the Book of Ecclesiastes belonged to the time of the Maccabees. He called the Epistle of St. James a right strawy epistle which flatly contradicted St. Paul[45] and he thought that it must have been written by some Jew who had heard of the Christians and not joined them. Carlstadt doubted the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and believed that the original form of the Gospels had not been preserved intact.[46]

All the Reformers would say quite definitely that 'Scripture *is* the Word of God,' but, if pressed, they would admit that the copula 'is' did not express logical identity, but 'some such relation as can be more exactly rendered by *contains*, *presents*, *conveys*, *records*—all of which phrases are used'[47] in their writings. 'Their theory as to the authority of Scripture is based upon the concurrent witness of the Holy Spirit in the written word and in the believer's soul.'[48] But, in point of fact, they are not really consistent in their views. They did not realize the seriousness of the problem and made no resolute attempt to solve it. 'When a contradiction occurs in Holy Scripture,' said Luther, 'so let it go.'[49]

[42] E. F. Pollard, *op. cit.*, p. 229.

[43] F. W. Farrar, *op. cit.*, p. 320. See, for instance, his notes on Lk. xxii, 3'); John ii, 19, 20.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 345. *e.g.* Mt. xxvii, 9; Acts vii, 16 ('hic locus corrigendus est').

* Quoted by L. E. Binns, *The Reformers and the Bible*, p. 22.

[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 335, 336. C. S. Carter, *The Reformers and Holy Scripture*, p. 25.

[46] E. F. Pollard, *op. cit.*, p. 229.

[47] T. M. Lindsay, *op. cit.* I, p. 463.

[48] C. Beard, *op. cit.* p. 123.

[49] F. W. Farrar, *op. cit.* p. 337.

The next generation of Protestant Theologians maintain a similar attitude. The difficulties of various sorts in Scripture do not escape their notice. They are fond of quoting a saying of Gregory's 'that there are some places in which an elephant may swim, and others through which a lamb may wade.'[50] But whereas they recognize the existence even of apparent inaccuracies, and indeed come and look at some of them, they commonly pass by on the other side. Very soon many of them developed a theory of the verbal inerrancy of Holy Scripture. Thus William Whitaker, Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, in his *Disputation on Holy Scripture* published in 1588, will not admit as allowable the opinion of Jerome, approved by Erasmus, that in St. Matthew xxvii, 9, the evangelist may have fallen into an error of memory in putting the name of Jeremiah instead of Zechariah. 'It does not become us to be so easy and indulgent,' he says, 'as to concede that such a lapse could be incident to the sacred writers . . . All Scripture is inspired of God, as St. Paul expressly writes, II Tim. iii, 16. Whereas, therefore, no one may say that any infirmity could befall the Holy Spirit, it follows that the sacred writers could not be deceived, or err, in any respect.'[51] But it is to be noted that Whitaker himself has no explanation to offer of the real difficulty in the passage quoted. The truth is that by 1588 we have already passed into the cheerless period in the history of Scriptural exegesis in which a new Protestant Scholasticism takes the place of the old. 'The Reformation soon parted company with free learning . . . held out no hand to awaking science, and lost itself in a maze of theological controversies.'[52]

V.

But rather than indulge in such melancholy reflections, let us endeavour to estimate the positive contribution made by the Reformation in its initial stages to the right understanding and use of Holy Scripture. Three points stand out above all others. First, the Reformers were working under the stimulus and inspiration of a great idea and a fresh personal experience of reli-

[50] *E.g.* Bishop Jewel, *Works* (Parker Soc.): I, p. 331; II, p. 684. W. Whitaker, *Disputation on Scripture*, pp. 374, 400.

[51] p. 37 (ed. Parker Soc.).

[52] F. W. Farrar, *op. cit.*, p. 358.

gion. They regarded St. Paul's Epistles as *the key and true commentary to all Holy Scripture*.[53] They, or at all events their most active leaders, had recapitulated in themselves St. Paul's own experience, and were rejoicing in the free grace of God to which alone they trusted to put them into a right relation with Him.

Secondly, mightily encouraged by what they had found in St. Paul, the Reformers set themselves to search the Bible as a whole, believing that true understanding of the Scriptures could be attained by 'a man that is studious, well willing, and often calling upon God in continual prayer, who giveth his Holy Spirit to them that desire it of him.' So, Latimer,[54] paraphrasing a passage in St. Augustine: and he adds, 'For such a one, though he be a layman, fearing God, is much more fit to understand holy scripture, than any arrogant and proud priest, yea, than the bishop himself, be he never so great and glistering in all his pontificals.'

Thirdly, what the Reformers endeavoured to discover in the Scriptures was *what was really there*—not what could be read into the text to bolster up vested interest, established usage, or generally received doctrine, but *what was really there*.

It is in these three respects that we to-day must follow the pioneers of the Reformation and continue along the lines of advance which have thus been marked out for us, though we find ourselves eventually in a position of which the Reformers themselves did not dream. First, our work will be most fruitful if it is inspired by a great idea and a living and personal experience of religion. And the great idea which has come to the men of this generation is the idea of God, All-sovereign, working through Evolution. We must go back to the Scriptures; but before we do so it would be well if under such guidance as that of Dr. Tennant in his two great volumes of Philosophical Theology, we examine for ourselves the grounds that actually exist here and now for reasonable belief in God, and here and now plant our feet firmly upon them. With that foothold and from that point of vantage we then look back upon the working of God—Who always has been, as He still is, at work—during the period of human history and development covered by Holy

[53] Ridley, quoted above p. 277. [54] *Conferences*, pp. 113, 114.

Scripture. By such a discipline our minds will have been purified and we shall have no desire to ask from Scripture more than it really has to offer.

Secondly, we shall conduct our studies as not merely theoretical but practising Theists. We shall search in the spirit of the ancient collect, and we could hardly do better than use its very words : *all our work begun, continued and ended in Thee.* We shall be spurred on by the expectancy which is faith. For if God has ever spoken, He speaks still. 'God,' said Luther, 'does not speak grammatical vocables, but true essential things. Thus sun and moon, Peter and Paul, thou and I, are nothing but words of God.' Karl Barth, with all his unnecessary and irritating parodoxes, is, no doubt, as he claims to be, in true prophetic succession to Luther.

Thirdly, we shall keep steadily before us the one aim of discovering in Scripture *what is really there.* Inconsistencies are really there. But now we have means of dealing with them unknown to our predecessors of the Reformation. We have the methods of Comparative Religion, the assistance of Psychology, still in its infancy but nevertheless indispensable, the co-operation of the archaeologist and the general historian, scientifically trained. As a preparation for the study of the Old Testament we read the Cambridge Ancient History. Similar help is gradually becoming available for the study of the New.

The Old Testament is not really what it seemed to be in the sixteenth century. The Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis has had to be modified, but substantially it stands, and is likely to stand. The Pentateuch in its present form is post-, not pre-, exilic. The historical books are by no means scientifically compiled histories, but collections of tradition and reminiscence remoulded into a highly-imaginative story, enchantingly told with religious edification in view. The fragments of the prophets remain, many of them at present undateable—the prophets, by whom the Holy Ghost spake and speaks. As for the Wisdom books and the Psalms, which took their present shape in the Greek period or later, they are treasure-houses in which priceless jewels are preserved together with a certain amount of iron that has outlasted its use.

Such a view of the Old Testament is finding increasing acceptance to-day, and opposition to it, though far from dead, is being driven back into comparatively few and restricted areas. It is rather otherwise, at present, with the New Testament. Here the results of modern research have been to a much less extent accepted and assimilated. The Gospels are not, either singly or all together, a biography in the modern sense of the term. They represent the reminiscences collected by the second generation of Christians and coloured by their hopes and beliefs and religious experience. Our views of St. Paul and his Epistles are probably the least changed of any of our Biblical views. And through these Epistles indirectly, as through the Gospels indirectly from another angle, shines the Life that was and is the Light of men.

We must continue our studies: much remains to be done: and until we have a new and more comprehensive Reformation the Church of Christ will never win the allegiance of the modern world. Of the Reformers of the twentieth century no oath is required, but they will do well, as they brace themselves to the great task before them, to take a pledge in their own hearts. It must be some such pledge as that required at the Reformation settlement of the members of the Chapter of Westminster: 'always to prefer truth to custom, the Bible to tradition, and to embrace with their whole soul the true religion of Christ.'[55]

[55] Vera consuetis, scripta non scriptis, semper ante habiturum, veram Christi religionem omni animo complexurum. A. P. Stanley, *Memorials of Westminster Abbey*, p. 410. A similar oath was required of the Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, by the Statutes of 1552 and 1560. J. B. Mullinger, op. cit. II, p. 582. For further study: C. Beard, *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century in its relation to Modern Thought and Knowledge*. Hibbert Lectures (1883; new edition 1927). L. E. Binns, *The Reformers and the Bible* (1923). C. S. Carter, *The Reformers and Holy Scripture* (1928).

THE REFORMATION AND DIVINE WORSHIP

By F. C. Burkitt, D.D., F.S.A., Norrisian Professor in the University of Cambridge.

FROM the point of view of this Conference my subject, *The Reformation and Divine Worship*, obviously falls into two main parts. There is the Reformation in general, with the ideas of worship therewith connected, and the Reformation in England. The Reformation in England was a very peculiar growth, conditioned by a peculiar set of circumstances. It did not start from the principles of the Continental Reformation, though as time went on it was much influenced by those principles; and the result, both in doctrine and in worship, has been correspondingly different.

First, a word or two about the Continental Reformation. It was not Nationalist but Theological. Neither Luther, nor Zwingli, nor Calvin was the head or minister of either of the new rising nations. The nationalist spirit was there — witness the effect of Luther's German Bible and of Marot's French Psalter — but the directing spirit during the decisive period of formation was theological. Luther was brought up in a religion of which the catch-word was 'the Church and the Sacraments': he saw that the Church was corrupt and changed his catch-word into 'the Word and the Sacraments.' This new catch-word, when the idea of 'the Word' had had time to work, produced among those outside Luther's direct influence the New Model of Calvinism which we may venture to formulate as 'the Word and its Sacraments.' Like all simplifications these formulae are not entirely accurate or comprehensive, but they will serve for our purpose to-day.

The England of the first half of the sixteenth century was quite different from the enlightened parts of continental Europe. It was distinguished, first of all, by a very strong national self-consciousness, and this self-consciousness expressed itself in a strong loyalty to the King. During the latter part of the fifteenth century the great nobles of England had happily wiped them-

selves out in the Wars of the Roses, just at the very moment when great feudal houses were becoming meaningless in State affairs. Meanwhile the new mercantile towns, Bristol, Norwich, Lynn, Reading, etc., were acquiring an independent status, and it was neither to the Pope nor to any local noble they looked to secure their new status and privileges, but to the King.[1]

From a religious point of view what one notices in England during the century preceding Henry VIII's quarrel with Rome is the growth of a secular spirit. There was very little heresy. Lollardism had been stamped out, but the vigour and energy that had found vent in Lollardry did not return to the Church: it was diverted to secular pursuits and studies. I think, also, the discovery of the New World had its part. Here was a great new fact, a great new field of adventure; and it was wholly secular. It had not been envisaged by the practical policy or the speculative theory of the Church: the Church had not known of it beforehand.

At the beginning of the reign of Henry VIII the Church in England was wealthy and seemed to be powerful. It was not unpopular, but it had ceased to lead. The friars had long outlived their early reputation for holiness and sympathy with the poor. The monks were rich landlords, but they had ceased to have a monopoly of learning or art: if they acquired new books, whether written or printed, they bought them like their poorer neighbours and no longer made them themselves. The bishops and clergy looked to the King to protect them: they themselves were tied to the Canon Law, and if they had any defence against outsiders, against the appointment of non-resident aliens to fat livings and canonries, it was to be looked for in the masterful way in which the secular power of their Lord the King had refused to allow this or that section of the Canon Law to be operative in his realm. Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, better than any other (so far as I can see), represents the general feelings of the English clergyman of his day. In theology and ritual he was stiffly conservative, but he believed in the royal supremacy, and this belief led him to repudiate the Pope and to acquiesce in the suppression of the monasteries. When a Papist Queen came in, he accepted the Pope again.

[1] See Mrs. J. R. Green's *English Towns in the Fifteenth Century*.

Henry VIII's quarrel with the Pope over his divorce from Catharine of Aragon is an historical accident, one of those queer happenings which produce so much that was unforeseen, more especially by the chief actors in the actual drama. Henry was a most accomplished prince, neither better nor worse in his private morals than most of his contemporaries, but he was particularly anxious to have a legitimate heir to succeed him. Failing to get his divorce from the Pope, he broke with him, and the English clergy, like the English people, stood by their King against their Patriarch. A few clear-sighted and logical people — how few English people in any age have been logical! — saw what was happening and lost their heads on the scaffold. A little later some Protestant sectaries were burnt at Smithfield. Neither the one set of executions nor the other really moved the English people. It was different when, a little over twenty years later, Thomas Cranmer was burnt at Oxford during the reaction under Queen Mary. Cranmer really did embody the English point of view, its patriotism, its secularity, its dislike of alien dominion. If he differed from most of his contemporaries it was chiefly in his superior learning and ingenuity. His final heroism, after a good many unheroic shuffles, was repeated in the England of Elizabeth, which after much diplomatic tergiversation, finally endured the Catholic onslaught of the Armada. Cranmer has left a memorial of himself in the Book of Common Prayer — both editions. The ideas represented by this Book, in its two editions, it is now time to indicate.

The break with Rome occurred in 1534. As I said just now, there was no doctrinal Protestantism involved. It was presently followed by a Papal excommunication, but that left Henry unmoved. He made no submission, and he died in 1547, a reigning and successful king, and was succeeded peaceably by his son. Henry was a conservative in doctrine and ritual, and little change in public worship was made during his reign. But the years from '34 to '47 marked a good deal of change in English views about religion. Tyndale's New Testament had appeared in 1525, and came surreptitiously into England : he himself was executed on the continent in 1536. But in the meantime, so popular had the Bible in English become that in 1540 a fresh edition was issued at home with episcopal authority. This was

in itself an indication of the new nationalist impulse given to the Church by Henry's quarrel: what had been the Church in England was becoming the Church of England.

It is very difficult to ascertain how far Lutheran and Calvinistic views had penetrated in England by the end of Henry's reign. A large part of the population could not read. On the other hand, a number of new clergy, to whom the new ideas were familiar, must have been scattered up and down the parishes of England before the accession of Edward VI. In and about London there was a large Protestant party, and, speaking generally, I suppose that at this period most of the energy, the enthusiasm, the verve, was to be found among the Protestants. The official view during this last period of Henry's reign is well represented by *The King's Book* (1543), in which is set forth the 'necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christian man.' Two quotations may be given. On the one hand it is asserted in the Preface that 'the reading of the Old and New Testament is not so necessary for all these folks [*i.e.* the part of the Church which is ordained to be taught], that of duty they ought and be bound to read it, but as the prince and the policy of the realm shall think convenient.' On the other, we read about the Lord's Prayer that 'it is meet and much requisite that the unlearned people should use to make their prayers in their mother tongue which they best understand, whereby they may be the more moved and stirred unto devotion and the more earnestly mind the thing that they pray for.' Good sound advice, no doubt, whether the sentence was penned by Cranmer, or Gardiner, or King Henry himself; but in the first half of the sixteenth century it was a finger-post pointing in the direction of a reformed service.

King Henry died and King Edward succeeded. The 'Supreme Head' of the Church in England was no longer an experienced theologian, but a little boy whose advisers were Protestants. In less than a couple of years Archbishop Cranmer was ready with an English Prayer-Book. There can be little doubt that it represents Cranmer's views almost exclusively. No one approached him in liturgical learning or in interest about the subject. None of the Reformers was so Catholic; none of the Catholics wanted this great break with the past. None was

so devoted to the reformed watchword of 'the Word and the Sacraments,' but Cranmer had a different apprehension of 'the Word' from his contemporaries.

The Book of 1549 is a Breviary and Missal combined. It will be convenient to consider these separately. In fact, for considering Cranmer's work three pairs of contrasts must be considered. There is the Breviary and the Missal, the layman and the priest, the 'Word' and the Sacraments. The 'Word' is somewhat difficult to define. There was a sense in which it meant Canonical Scripture, as contrasted with the Church and modern uses and superstitions. The study of the Old and New Testaments did, at the very first glance, reveal a totally different state of things from the mediaeval Papacy. If reform be needed, the first necessity was to study the infallible guide of Scripture, which for long time past had been read merely in extracts. The time which might have been reserved for the reading of Scripture had been taken up by reading Homilies from the Fathers or Legends of Saints.

> "The Book of Isaiah was begun in Advent and the Book of Genesis in Septuagesima; but they were only begun and never read through. . . . And moreover, whereas St. Paul would have such language spoken to the people in the church as they might understand and have profit by hearing the same, the service in this Church of England these many years hath been read in Latin to the people, which they understand not, so that they have heard with their ears only, and their hearts, spirit and mind have not been edified thereby. . . . So that here you have an order for prayer (as touching the reading of Holy Scripture) much agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old Fathers and a great deal more profitable and commodious than that which of late was read. It is more profitable, because here are left out many things, whereof some be untrue, some uncertain, some vain and superstitious; and is ordained nothing to be read but the very pure word of God, the holy Scriptures, or that which is evidently grounded upon the same, and that in such a language and order as is most easy and plain for the understanding both of the readers and hearers. It is the more commodious, both for the shortness thereof and for the plainness of the order and for that the rules be few and easy."[2]

And further, Cranmer urges that if in the new order all must be 'read upon the book,' yet if those who read will weigh their labour with the profit in knowledge, which daily they shall obtain by reading upon the book, they will not refuse the pain in consideration of the great profit that shall ensue.

[2] From *Concerning the Service of the Church,* Cranmer's Preface to the Book of 1549.

In the familiar words quoted above Cranmer enjoins his 'Way of renewal' upon the Church of England. 'Come to church,' he says, 'and study Holy Writ, and you will learn all things necessary to your spiritual welfare, both those who read and those who listen.' In the first place, then, the Word of God is canonical Scripture, and this is set forth as the chief purpose for which Christian people come together. Further, both the hearers and the readers are envisaged, by which in the main he means laity and clergy. Both must study together, but the laity are to listen to the whole of Scripture, and in the order prescribed. All Holy Scriptures have been written for our learning, says Cranmer: we are in such wise to hear them read, to mark (*i.e.* attend), to learn and inwardly digest them, that this study is to be to our profit.[3] To quote Cranmer once more, for his pen undoubtedly drafted the injunctions relating to Sunday issued early in the reign of Edward VI, "all the King's faithful and loving subjects shall from henceforth celebrate and keep their holy day according to God's holy will and pleasure, that is, in *hearing the Word of God read* and taught."[4]

The new services, then, are both for clergy and laity. A few Sundays and Holy Days, such as Easter and Christmas, have special Lessons, but otherwise the Bible-reading is continuous. To make this rational, the attendance of the laity on week-days must be assumed. It only took three years to show that this desirable ideal could not be assumed in practice, and the revised Book of 1552 has a set of Sunday readings independent of those on week-days. On the other hand, the new order was considerably more 'commodious' for the clergy. The old system of seven offices a day is changed for two, Mattins and Evensong, and these are only longer in the amount of continuous Bible-reading.

But besides faith in Bible study another Anglican dogma may be found in Cranmer's Prayer-Book by those who look for it. This is the belief that the corruptions of Christianity were comparatively recent, and that the ancient Fathers of the Church understood and practised the true evangelical religion. In some ways, indeed, this notion was true enough. The sale of Indulgences by Tetzel had been the last straw that broke the back of

[3] I assume here the inaccuracy of the comma before 'read.'

[4] Strype's *Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer*, ed. of 1848, vol. ii, p. 454.

Luther's allegiance to the existing system: such indulgences were more or less of a novelty, and the sale of such things was a new scandal. To the first Reformers of the sixteenth century it seemed as if it was only needed to suppress pernicious novelties such as these to recover the true Christianity. Calvinism attempted to go back to the age of the Apostles, Anglicanism to an ideal Catholicism acknowledged both by East and West, situated somewhere before the coming of Islam and the break-up of the old civilization. Both were theoretically imperfect, but it is only in our own days, in the light of our better knowledge of the past, that we can see where the defects lay. The fault of Calvinism was in attempting to stereotype what was essentially a passing phase: the New Testament and the Church organization there depicted imply a vivid belief in the near-approaching Coming of Christ. Geneva was a force in the world as long, and only as long, as there was a vivid belief in the near coming of the Kingdom of God on earth. From the middle of the seventeenth century this belief passed away, and with it the influence of Geneva. The fault of Anglicanism was in its wholly irrational basis. There never was an ideal time for Christendom, and whether one takes the first three or the first six centuries one finds not only superstition, but also practices and beliefs unsuitable for our age and our conditions. Nevertheless, like many another English compromise, the imperfect theory worked well enough for a time; it enabled the English Church to keep more of the old religion than logical Protestantism kept, and so it could assimilate the great mass of English conservatives in religion during what were really the bad days for Protestantism; I mean the days when the Counter-Reformation was a reality, when the energy, the enthusiasm, and the verve which had been the hall-mark of the Protestants had passed over to the reorganized Papalists.

That state of things had not begun in Edward VI's reign, and the Book of 1549 pleased very few. The Breviary part of it passed muster, and the changes made in the Second Prayer-Book, that of 1552, are mainly improvements such as are to be looked for in a second edition. But the Missal of 1552, the Order for Holy Communion, is in many ways quite new. Here we enter upon a fresh department of our subject, so vital that it is still an active point of controversy.

As I said at the beginning, the catch-word of mediaeval Christianity may be given as 'the Church and the Sacraments.' The Church as an organization existed to give to Christians the Sacraments, which were the means by which Grace, the mysterious Divine power, was transmitted to them. Of the seven Sacraments one had come to overshadow all the rest, the Sacrament of the Altar. It had not at the beginning of Reform, in Luther's case, been at once a matter of controversy, but it had quickly and inevitably become so. The Protestant party considered that Cranmer's English Mass in his Book of 1549 was too near the Latin form to be acceptable to them : he was required to revise it.

The revision of 1552 is known as the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI. It was abolished in the following year when Mary Tudor succeeded her brother, and reinstated when Elizabeth came to the throne in 1558. By the time of the Restoration of Charles II it had been used by English Churchmen for a century and was endeared to conservatives, such (for instance) as Anthony Sparrow, to whom it represented ancient tradition as contrasted with Presbyteral or sectarian innovations, and it remains the established rite. All this helps to hide from English Churchmen the daring innovations by which it differed from all previous rites, whether Western or Eastern, Protestant or Catholic. We are now in a new age of innovation and important changes are being called for, both from responsible and irresponsible quarters. Our first and most pressing duty, as English Churchmen, is to understand what we have got, and not to change until we fully realise what we must give up if we attempt to fall into line with other Churches whether reformed or unreformed.

What Cranmer did in 1552, what is still done in the English Church, is to interlace the consecration and oblation of the Sacrament with the communion of clergy and people. In all other Liturgies these are separate, communion following consecration and oblation. Why did Cranmer do this, and what is the ritual effect of the change which he made?

Here, as before, we must keep more than one thing in mind. There is a controversy between Latin and Greek, as well as a controversy between Catholic and Protestant. It is one of Cranmer's great merits that in the former controversy he was a

sound Latin liturgist, though he had studied the Greek rite and picked out from it that admirable prayer which we know as the Prayer of St. Chrysostom.[5] But he did not adopt the central points of the Greek service. It is necessary, I venture to think, to explain this at some length.

Let us forget for the moment the Protestant objections and doubts. What do Catholics desire to do in the Mass? What is the sacrifice of Christians? The answer is that the only proper sacrifice for Christians to offer is the Body and Blood of Christ, once for all offered on Calvary, by which we are reconciled to God, and God to us. When there were still heathens all around the Christians were called Atheists, just because it was evident that they offered no sacrifices like others. Among themselves, indeed, the Christians were persuaded that they did represent, did make present to themselves, the Sacrifice of Calvary, that the bread and wine which they offered to God and then themselves ate was indeed in the sight of God the Sacrifice of Calvary. But how, by what process, can bread and wine become the Body and Blood of Christ? This is the point in which East and West came to differ.

The East offered to God a sacrifice of bread and wine, and then prayed that God would be pleased to send His Spirit into the bread and wine to turn that offering into the proper Christian offering of the Body and Blood of Christ. The West, on the other hand, declared that no sacrifice was acceptable for Christians to offer, even for a moment, but the Body and Blood of Christ: the change, therefore, must take place before the actual offering, before the priest says *offerimus*. It must therefore take place while the priest, in reciting the tale of the Last Supper, does what Christ did. In the fully-developed Roman theory, before the priest says *Hoc est corpus meum* the wafer is mere bread; after he has said the decisive word the wafer has become the Lord's Body.

At the moment, let me repeat, we are considering as Catholics. We are accepting the Catholic theory that in this service the Body of Christ is made present. That being conceded, I think we must confess that the Latin view is more Christian, more

[5] Prayer of the 3rd Antiphon, just before the Little Entrance (Brightman, *L.E.W.*, p. 367).

Evangelical, than the Greek view. No sacrifice for Christians, even for a moment, but the sacrifice of Calvary! We can acceptably offer to God nothing but Jesus Christ on the Cross. We can offer this, but (according to the Roman Mass) not even this can we claim as in itself availing: we beseech God to accept what we have done, to accept it as He accepted the sacrifices of Abel and Melchisedec of old, to confirm in heaven what we have done on earth.

But now a new set of considerations comes in for us, who have seriously considered with the Reformers the inherent difficulties of these beliefs. Is transubstantiation credible? Can we really believe that at the word of an official a wafer can cease to be a wafer and become something else? Christ said *This is my Body*: St. Paul said *Ye, the Church, are the Body of Christ.*[6] St. Paul's dictum no doubt is true, but it is certainly figurative; may not Christ's dictum be figurative also?

If one reads Ridley's *Brief Declaration of the Lord's Supper*, or any other sixteenth century 'Protestant' tractate, one finds oneself in a peculiar atmosphere. It is not the atmosphere of the eighteenth century, the atmosphere of rationalism; certainly not the atmosphere of modern historical criticism. The atmosphere is that of scholasticism, the world envisaged is the mediaeval world with heaven above us, where the natural body of our Lord is situated, and the disputants on earth seem to know by intuition all about the 'nature' and 'substance' of bodies. They have no conception of the gradual evolution of beliefs and doctrines. What the Protestants have is the new doctrine of the Word, and in this connexion the Word means the New Testament read without the presuppositions of the Church. The Eucharistic Bread in the New Testament they felt had a far less virtue and importance than it had in the Catholic theory of their contemporary adversaries. It had overshadowed the direct influence of a realized Christ on the mind, so that they desired to reduce their view of it to its true proportions.

To come back to Cranmer and his Second Prayer-Book, we find him set to produce a Missal less Roman than his book of 1549. In what direction shall he go? Most characteristically he

[6] See *e.g.* Bishop Poynet's *Dialecticon* (p. 62): *i.e.* this point is urged by others as well as Cranmer.

did not go in the direction of Geneva, but in that of St. Augustine. We can learn Cranmer's own views about the 'Lord's Supper' from his elaborate controversy with Bishop Gardiner.[7] Not only is 'the true use of the Lord's Supper to be restored again; wherein godly people assembled together may receive the sacrament, every man for himself,'—that is to say, Cranmer insisted on Communion by all present, as distinct from merely being present at the action of the priest,—in addition to this he had a theory of the proper Christian sacrifice.

> "Forasmuch," says Crnmer, "as He—that is, Christ—hath given Himself to death for us, to be an oblation and sacrifice unto His Father for our sins, let us give ourselves again unto Him, making an oblation, not of goats, sheep, etc., . . . but of a creature that hath reason, that is, of ourselves. . . . These be the oblations of Christian men, these hosts and oblations be acceptable to Christ."

In other words, the sacrifice in the Eucharist was to be retained, not done away with, as contemporary Protestants demanded, but it was to be the sacrifice of Christians offering themselves. The only proper Christian sacrifice to be offered to God was indeed the Body of Christ, but the Christians were Christ's Body: the Christian offering was to be, not transformed bread and wine, but living Christians.

And further, this was no sixteenth century whim of Cranmer's; he got it, and in effect confesses that he got it, from St. Augustine:

> "If you wish to understand 'the Body of Christ,' hear the Apostle saying to the faithful 'Ye are the Body of Christ and the Members': the mystery of yourselves is placed on the Lord's Table, the mystery of yourselves you receive."[8]

And again:

> "This is the sacrifice of Christians, 'the many one body in Christ,' which also the Church solemnizes by the sacrament of the altar, . . . where it is shewn to her that in the very thing that she offers she herself is offered."[9]

This is what St. Augustine actually says.

How was all this to be effected? How was it to be done, in such a way as would combine this truly ancient and Catholic idea with the maximum of the older forms? How could sinful Christian men and women dare to act the part of the Body of Christ? It was just this that Cranmer attained by his transposi-

[7] Cranmer's *Works* (Parker Society's ed.), i, 349. See on this my *Christian Worship*, p. 99.

[8] *Serm.* 272.

[9] *De Civitate Dei*, x, 6.

tions, by his interlacing of the forms of consecration and communion. In the English rite, as it has been ever since 1552, the congregation, having confessed, having been absolved, having 'assisted' at the consecration of the bread and the wine, having received the consecrated species, has been made actually, so far as any ritual act can effect anything, into a not unworthy representation of the spiritual Body of Christ. And then and there they 'offer and present' their souls and bodies to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto God.

As I have ventured to say elsewhere (*Christian Worship*, p. 100):

> "If there be any sacrifice in the Lord's Supper, it is the sacrifice of the Body of Christ. If there be any sacrifice in the English order, as it has been since 1552, it is the offering of ourselves. Cranmer brought these two ideas together, as near as ritual can do such a thing, by not allowing the priest and people to offer themselves until they had duly received the Sacrament. He was not quite consistent, it is true, for he allowed the Post-Communion Prayer of 1549, in which there is no oblation, to stand as an alternative. In this inconsistency he was unconsciously making a forecast of the then future history of the Church of England, in which there has ever existed side by side those who specially value the Holy Communion as a valid re-presentation of the sacrifice of Calvary and those who find its whole worth and value in the assurance that they are 'incorporate in the mystical Body of Christ, which is the blessed company of all faithful people.'"

The only change I would press for is to include both prayers, to leave the first prayer ('O Lord and heavenly Father') as it is, to be followed (before or after the 'Glory be to God on high') by the second prayer, with the necessary simplification in the concluding doxology. This simple change is not, however, the alternative with which we are faced. The Bishops' Book, rejected by the House of Commons in 1928, was an attempt to please those who ascribe particular holiness or potency to the consecrated elements, not by going back to the Roman Mass or to Cranmer's first Prayer-Book, but by mixing up our English consecration with forms derived from the Greeks.

In this tendency the Prayer-Book put forward in 1928 had certain predecessors, about which a word or two may not be out of place here. We all know the story of Jennie Geddes, who flung her stool at the Bishop of Edinburgh in St. Giles's Cathedral in 1637. What is not so well known is the nature of the offending service. The Scottish service, drawn up under Laud's

auspices, was reckoned by its authors, like the book of 1928, to be a better service than the English one, something that contained the Catholic doctrine purged of Roman errors. Behind the forms of the service itself there is a theory which at various times has exercised a curious influence on Anglican theology. Briefly and crudely it may be expressed by saying that as the Roman order has become corrupted, we turn to the Greeks to recover the form of Apostolical Christianity.

In the struggle of the English Church against Papalism, in which the Anglicans were endeavouring to purge their forms and ceremonies from 'Papal' errors, it was natural to overlook the Roman conservatism, and to regard that in which other pre-Reformation rites differed from Rome as something primitive. In the days of Laud, as in the days of Cranmer, little was known about Eastern forms of worship but the existing Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, as it is called, now used by the orthodox Greek Church. This, it is true, is an ancient rite, but it is very far from being primitive, and in particular the prayer to God to send His Holy Spirit to consecrate the elements into the Body and Blood of Christ is not primitive. But it was just that feature in it which endeared it to a whole succession of Anglican High Churchmen.

The Scottish rite contained an oblation of the Eucharistic elements: as to this, Archbishop Laud remarked that it was right and proper, and that 'he was sorry it was not in the Book of England.'[10] The Laudian tradition was carried on by the Non-Jurors, who were further confirmed in their opinions by the so-called Pfaffian Fragment of Irenaeus.[11] This bare-faced forgery, now unmasked and discredited, was the work of a certain Professor Pfaff of Tübingen, who hoped thereby to bring about a closer union or understanding between Lutherans and Roman Catholics. The 'fragments' were published in 1715: they were suspected at once, but the demonstration that they were mere forgeries was only made by Harnack in this century. I think it was Lord Acton who made the remark that Harnack's demonstration was all the more important in that he obviously was unacquainted with the use that English High Churchmen had made of the fragments! The whole matter is too long and too

[10] Collier's *Ecclesiastical History*, ii, 770*b*.
[11] Harvey's *Irenaeus*, ii, 500-4 (Fragm. xxxvi).

technical to go into here. The main point is that a consecration of the bread and wine by an invocation of the Holy Spirit after the oblation is expressly set forth.

Here indeed was ancient testimony! The other Eucharistic references in Irenaeus, who lived at the end of the second century, were interpreted by the Pfaffian fragments, and so the invocation (or *epiclesis*) of Chrysostom and the Scottish Prayer-Book was carried back almost directly to Apostolic times.

'Well,' you may say, 'we have never heard of Professor Pfaff or of his fragments, which (so they say) are forgeries. We really haven't read much of Irenaeus, still less based our Eucharistic theories on his writings. Why do you bring these things in?' I bring it all in because it illustrates the way in which all theories which look back to the past come ultimately under the scrutiny of the historian and the critic, and that the day of the historian and critic has not wholly passed is proved by the emergence in 1928 of projects which were knocked on the head in 1637.

There is another sphere in which the Reformation has had an influence on Divine worship. I will venture to say a word in defence of the English custom — it is no more — of attending Mattins and then on most Sundays going out without Holy Communion. The Eucharistic service is no doubt the principal part of Christian worship. The early Christians assembled Sunday by Sunday, and also on whatever Holy Days they kept (anniversaries of their venerated Martyrs, and such like), to take together the sacred Meal, which was the sign of their fellowship with Christ and with one another, and the pledge and assurance of the continual grace and help that God would give them through Christ. In more prosperous times, when Christianity was dominant, they still came together for the same service, though in course of time the emphasis came to be laid on the process of consecration, and mere laymen were content to watch without sharing in the meal.

Meanwhile persons who had volunteered to live a fully professed Christian life, as the Christian life was then understood — monks first, and then priests of all sorts — took upon themselves the *opus Dei*, as it was called. In other words, they sang the Psalms, as much as they reasonably could, the details varying according to circumstances. Out of this continual recitation

of the Psalter, with the various pious readings and accompanying prayers with which it came to be associated, grew the Office Hours. It was the special duty of the mediaeval clerk, in addition to the celebration of, or attendance at, the Eucharist, to repeat the psalms, the readings, and the prayers of the Hours.

The new order, instituted by Cranmer in 1549 and continued in the subsequent revision, substituted for these Hours the two much shorter services of Mattins and Evensong, and encouraged the laity to associate themselves in these services with the parson. The net result, so far as Sundays are concerned, appears to our modern ways somewhat formidable. Anthony Sparrow, for instance, writing in the middle of the seventeenth century, names 9 a.m. as the proper hour for beginning the Communion Service, before which he assumes there would be Mattins and Litany![12] The corresponding Puritan services were undoubtedly of a similar length. Further, the new order was different in its emphasis from the old Hours. In those the chanting of the Psalms was the principal thing; the Lessons were attached to the chanting of the Psalms. In the new order the emphasis was laid on hearing the Bible read: there was also provision made for a sermon, for exposition as well as simple reading: in other words, for what was, in intention at least, the direct 'ministry of the Word.' And, while the people were from time to time exhorted to take the Holy Communion, they were definitely discouraged from non-communicating attendance at the 'Supper.'

We all know the historical result. English lay-folk took to coming to the Morning Service, and they stayed for the sermon, but went out before the Holy Communion. In our days every effort is made to discourage this practice, and those who discourage it, even to the length of encouraging 'non-communicating attendance,' have a good liturgical and historical case. I venture here to say a word or two on the other side.

According to the doctrine contained in the Catholic Eucharist the service is a very serious matter. The changes introduced by Cranmer, when considered attentively, make it still more serious. Not only is everything done in English; the congregation has itself to play a serious part. No doubt it is nothing more than Christian people are nominally bound to do, but still

[12] Sparrow's *Rationale*, p. 244.

it is a fresh profession of Christian endeavour and aspiration. If Christian people are unwilling to do this at all they give a non-Christian impression to the world at large, so very rightly and properly a minimum was insisted on, and Cranmer's Book names Easter with a couple of other days when the faithful were expected to make their communion. But the Prayer-Book does not insist that they must communicate every Sunday. From time to time, then as now, the congregation hears exhortations to attend more regularly, and a minority find a profit in doing so. There are others, in these days when there is no compulsion, who do not feel impelled to attend church at all. But there remain a large number who feel that they are confronted by the alternative of staying away or of taking the Holy Communion without that internal elevation of mind, which an Englishman may indeed reach two or three times a year, but not every Sunday. I do not think that the clergy always realize that a kind of belief in the value of Holy Communion, and in the religion which Holy Communion represents, is sometimes dumbly testified by staying away, more than by perfunctory attendance. The pulpit, very likely, is not the proper place for the public utterance of this sentiment: I make it here, because I suppose we are here all sincerely attached to our ancient services, even if some of us feel that we lose rather than gain by their multiplication.

There is one other department of Christian worship, with a reference to which I will close, though in truth the English Reformation had very little to do with it. In the first part of the sixteenth century most serious persons were agreed that the traditional rites of the Church were too complicated and that there was need for a change. They differed much among themselves, but nearly all were agreed that the first thing to be got rid of was hymns. Roman Catholics, Calvinists, and Anglicans —all were willing to suppress hymn-singing. Roman Catholic reformers suppressed all the sequences but four out of the Missal. The Calvinists said that if any Christian was merry he should sing psalms. The English Prayer-Books had all the traditional hymns cut out: there is, indeed, one hymn prescribed (besides the *Te Deum*), *viz.* the 'Glory be to God on High,' which is printed in prose. There was also a hymn inserted in the new Burial Service, but it also is printed as prose, and few

people to this day recognize it as a hymn. And there is the hymn *Veni, Creator Spiritus*, in the Ordinal.

The fact is, that the mediaeval hymn occupied the same sort of artistic position as the anthem in a cathedral service. It was a complicated affair, known to the choir alone, and the sixteenth century Reformers wanted congregations to be edified. That they could be edified by hymn-singing was not imagined by them. All that was permitted was that by an Injunction of Queen Elizabeth in 1559 'there may be sung an hymn, or such-like song, to the praise of Almighty God, in the best sort of melody and music that may be conveniently devised' at the beginning or the end of Common Prayers.

Two things, indeed, need to be remembered about the England of the sixteenth century. On the one hand music itself was changing its character: one style of music was going out and another coming in, so that old tunes were not really popular. On the other hand there were hardly any English hymns ready. The old services had been in Latin, and even of such things as English Christmas Carols there was not a large stock.

I have said how almost all the Reformers were prejudiced against hymns. But there was one great exception — Martin Luther. Luther was himself a distinguished musician, and he knew the power of popular music. Further, his countrymen were musical. Germans had already had a large store of religious verse set to simple tunes in their own language. All Luther needed to do was to adapt the verses for his new German order of public worship. A conservative theologian complained that in Germany 'the people sang themselves into heresy,' but that was only possible because there was a good stock of tunes and hymns already available.

In England things were very different. The translations from the German made by Coverdale and others were cumbrous and did not become popular, and English hymn-singing, both among those loyal to the Elizabethan Settlement and those friendly to Presbyterian ideals, was for more than a century confined to the pedestrian metrical versions of the Psalms which were from time to time produced. It was not till the days of Isaac Watts, from about the year 1700, that hymn-singing became popular among English people.

But this is a large subject that demands a treatment of it which would go a long way beyond 'the Reformation and Divine Worship.' I have tried this morning to indicate to you the main course of the development of the specifically Anglican service, which in itself is a mirror of the very peculiar course of the Reformation of the Church of England. Henry VIII, when he broke with the Papacy and led his people out into the open to find a new way of religion, was fortunate in having a genius in liturgy, such as Cranmer was, to guide its way of public worship. His work, so familiar to us all and yet so little understood by so many, deserves very careful study. Above all, in these days of change and impatience with what is inherited, all English Churchmen ought to understand and consider well the intent and meaning of Cranmer's work, to understand as well as to use the Prayer-Book which English Churchmen have inherited from Cranmer, before they consent to change it for some hotch-potch made out of alien rites. Laocoon saw clearly; and even if it be my fate to be strangled by unexpected monsters, I will say of the late Bishops' Prayer-Book, as Laocoon said of the Trojan Horse, *Quicquid id est, timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.*

Whatever it may be, I am afraid of Greek liturgical phraseology even if it be intended to enrich our English services.

PRIVATE JUDGMENT AND CHURCH TRADITION

By the Very Reverend W. R. Matthews, D.D., Dean of Exeter.

IT is often said that one of the great gifts of the Reformation to the world was the principle of private judgment. There is, of course, truth in this statement, but it would be, I suppose, a serious error to believe that the great Reformers made their protest against Rome with the conscious object of asserting the right of every individual to think out a religion for himself. Nor would it be true to allege that they were particularly inclined to a policy of religious toleration. In their own view their mission was something quite different from either of these things. It was to republish the Gospel which had been perverted and obscured by the traditions of men; not to assert the primacy of human reason but the supremacy of the Word of God. We might say that in so far as the Reformation was a liberating force and emancipated the private judgment, it was so inadvertently and by reason of an unexpected failure. The anticipation of Luther was that when once the pure word of God as contained in the Scriptures was preached and the Scriptures themselves available for the reading of all men, the true religion would be so apparent that all must agree upon it. He has no answer to those who ask him: Where shall we find the true religion and how shall we distinguish it from false, except Search the Scriptures.

Luther's strange vacillation on the question of religious toleration may be attributed to the perplexity which was caused in his mind by the lack of agreement among those who based their religion on the Bible. Thus in 1524 he declared, 'All should preach freely and stoutly as they are able and against whom they please'; but in the very next year he calls upon the secular power to suppress the Anabaptists. A similar contradiction appears in his attitude to private judgment, and the authority of the Church. He can write, 'It is each man's own business what he believes, and he himself must see to it that he believes aright'; but he can also say, 'This power the Church

certainly has: that she can distinguish the Word of God from the words of men . . . The mind pronounces with infallible assurance that three and seven are ten, and yet can give no reason why this is true, while it cannot deny that it is . . . Even such a perception is there in the Church, by the illumination of the Spirit, in judging and approving of doctrines.'[1]

Calvin at any rate had no wish that every man should interpret the divine oracles for himself. No one was more conscious than he of the natural imbecility of the human intellect or of the confusions and mistakes which must arise from unguided liberty of exegesis. The *Institutes of the Christian Religion* was put forward by him as a clue to the meaning of Scripture, a key to the meaning of Revelation. In the preface to the second edition he says, 'Having thus as it were prepared the way, I shall not feel it necessary in any commentaries on Scripture which I may afterwards publish to enter into long discussions of doctrine. In this way the pious reader will be saved much trouble and weariness, provided he comes furnished with a knowledge of the present work as an essential prerequisite.'

Nor again do the great Reformers contemplate the possibility of a man living the Christian life and holding the Christian faith outside the Christian Church. 'Extra ecclesiam nulla salus,' they had no quarrel with their Romanist opponents on the major premise; the difference was concerning the nature and identity of the 'ecclesia.' In famous words Calvin proclaims that there is only one Church and that it is the duty of all men to remain in communion with her. 'We may learn from her title of "Mother" how useful and even necessary it is for us to know her; since there is no other way of entrance into life, unless we are conceived by her, born of her, nourished at her breasts, and continually preserved under her care and government, until we are divested of this mortal flesh and become like the angels. For our infirmity will not admit of our dismission from her school; we must continue under her instruction and discipline to the end of our lives. Out of her bosom there can be no remission of sins . . . It is always dangerous to be separated from the Church' (*Inst.* iv, 1, 4). Calvin was far from

[1] *Cf.* Prof. J. W. Allen's essay on Luther in *Social and Political Ideas of the Renaissance and Reformation,* from which I derive these quotations.

wishing to set free the human spirit from moral and religious tutelage, and the German theocrat would have had all men in an ecclesiastical school more strict and efficient than that over which the Pope nominally presided.

There is indeed an element in Calvin's theology which contained a seed which might grow to private judgment. The whole of his system of thought is based upon the Bible. He is not a philosopher but a Biblical theologian. For him the Scriptures are the sole and sufficient authority. But the question arises, as it arises to-day for his modern disciple Karl Barth: How do we come to recognize the Word of God? What is the *causa cognoscendi* of the Bible's authority? To this question, which obviously lies at the root of the whole Reformation theology, Calvin at least has an explicit answer. Though to a small degree he relies upon extraneous considerations such as the antiquity of some of the books in the Canon, his real answer is the 'testimonium Sancti Spiritus.' The Bible commends itself to us as the Word of God by its very nature; it is self-evidencing, so that when we read it with a pious mind we cannot doubt that it is true and comes from God.

It is sufficiently evident that this doctrine, carried to its logical conclusion, would issue in a thoroughgoing individualism, since the evidence of Revelation would consist in the reaction of every person, taken one by one, to the Bible.

That individualism, however, which was the precursor of a thoroughgoing claim for the supremacy of private judgment, was not the product of the Protestantism of the Church reformers. It grows out of the Non-conformist religion of the kind described by Professor Troeltsch as the 'sect type.' It was the separatists who consciously adopted the position with regard to the Church which is well characterized by Canon Quick. 'The Church should not be regarded as belonging to the primary essence of the Christian gospel at all. Christianity is essentially constituted by an individual relation between the soul and God wrought through the atonement of Christ and maintained by the presence of His spirit . . . a true Church can never be more or other than simply a congregation or even an aggregation, of individually converted and inspired souls.' In the Quaker reduction of organized religion almost to vanishing point and in

the doctrine of the 'inner light' we may detect the ultimate extreme of individualism in religion.

But it must be doubted whether any of these views, even the most anti-ecclesiastical, are equivalent to what in modern speech is meant by 'private judgment.' Not one of them implied that the unassisted and unenlightened human reason is capable of arriving at religious truth. On its theological and religious side the Reformation was very far from being an assertion of the power and right of the individual reason. On the contrary, as compared with Catholic theology, the Reformers took a pessimistic view of the condition of man and were on the whole less rationalistic than the scholastic theology which they discarded. There was no dispute that the Holy Spirit is the sole author of religious insight and saving faith. The whole question was concerning the means by which the illumination and power of the Spirit are given. Does it come through the Church? Is it the Church which, according to the promise of Christ, is guided into all truth? Or is it the Bible commending itself by the testimony of the Spirit to the conscience of the individual? Or is it that the Spirit is given, with no mediation at all, directly to the elect soul?

The Reformation beyond all question had an indirect effect in promoting private judgment as the recognized court of appeal. The break up of Christendom, the spectacle of creed set against creed, threw upon many individuals the responsibility of choosing their own religion. There was an open clash of authorities, there were several competing versions of Christianity. Doubtless the majority chose their religion as a part of a mass movement, or from motives of prudence, but a few chose because after reflection they found one to be more reasonable than another. The rise of natural science had probably as much to do with the exaltation of the right of private judgment as Protestantism, and the beginning of modern philosophy had much more. As of old in Greece when the religious foundations of life seemed inadequate or uncertain men turned to the unbiassed reason for new guidance, so now the leading minds began the quest for a world-view based on rational thought. Descartes began the application of the method of universal doubt and the search for 'clear and distinct ideas,' and with it the 'age of reason.' The right of

private judgment is in reality the child of the philosophical movement of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and I suspect that while it always appeared a changeling among the Protestants, it was really at home among the Whigs.

If we ask what were the place and meaning of private judgment and Church tradition in the beginning of our religion, we find at once that there was nothing which strictly corresponded to either. There can be little doubt that the Christian in Apostolic times regarded the Church, the fellowship of believers, as of the essence of the Gospel. Nor again can there be serious question that 'the evidence of the New Testament as a whole seems convincingly to show that from the first the Christians regarded themselves as in a special sense the people of God, the true Israel, those who were waiting in the fellowship of Jesus the Messiah for the final manifestation of His Kingdom. Salvation was through membership in this community, which bestowed or guaranteed inheritance of the promises made by God to His chosen people.'[2] The conversion to Christianity never appears to be conceived as a process of rational reflection. It is not due to 'persuasive words of man's wisdom,' but to the power of the message itself calling forth a response in the soul of some. The New Testament knows of only one kind of man who is able and has the right to 'judge all things,' and he is the 'spiritual man,' the man who is already a partaker of the Spirit of Christ which is the life of the community. Just as little can we speak accurately of Church tradition in the New Testament. The Apostolic Church was in possession of no body of dogma or creed handed down from previous generations. It depended on tradition for its knowledge of the words and life and death of the Lord, but it was not living on a memory or a record, but upon the experience of the present power and life of Christ. As Canon Quick has well said, 'The first Christians were not primarily occupied with looking *backward* in memory to the words and acts of the Master who had left them, but rather in looking *forward* in anticipation of His second coming, and upward in mystical experience of His Living presence through the Spirit.'[3]

[2] Quick, *Catholic and Protestant Elements in Christianity*, p. 19.
[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 3.

Anyone who attempts to deal with the problem of Church tradition and private judgment as it presents itself in the modern world is likely to talk at random unless he makes clear his presuppositions. I beg leave then to state my own assumptions without of course attempting here to justify them. I approach the question from the standpoint of Catholic Modernism. By that I mean that I accept the belief of the primitive Church about itself as essentially true. I believe that the community is not an accident of Christianity but an essential element in it. I believe in the Holy Spirit, and that the special sphere of the operation of the Holy Spirit is the community of Christians. This does not mean of course that the action of the Spirit is confined to the Church, or that men may not be truly inspired by the Spirit who are outside the Church or even in bitter opposition to it at any given time. At any rate, so far from thinking that the Church is a 'necessary evil,' I hold it to be a necessary means of grace and the providential instrument of the Spirit of Christ in the world. To say less than this would be, so far as I can see, to cut oneself off from the root from which we spring.

I would next point out that there is no such thing as 'private judgment' in the strict meaning of the words, simply because there are no completely 'private' persons. The isolated and independent individual who exercises his intelligence upon data presented to him and makes up his mind solely by the light of his private reason, is a figment of the imagination and never existed in nature. We come out of the social environment, we are moulded by it, and our thoughts are tinged by it before we come to years of discretion; and when we do attain that status our judgments are to a great extent a reflection of the mind of the group to which we belong. This is not less true when perhaps we react violently against accepted opinions. Every rebel is this particular kind of rebel because of the tradition against which he protests, and from the tradition he derives the weapons with which he opposes it. There is of course a meaning in the term 'private judgment.' It indicates a position in which man has achieved relative independence, and has passed beyond unquestioning acceptance of the current coin of the mind. He is like a man who has jumped on to the shoulders of his fellows

in a crowd. He sees further than they, but every moment of his vision depends upon their support.

We may recognize two 'moments' as essential in the acquisition of genuine and fruitful private judgment. The first is the moment of appreciation and insight, when we penetrate into the meaning of the tradition, when it becomes no longer second-hand but our own possession by being thought afresh. This moment is too often omitted by those who cultivate the critical faculty. Much criticism of Christianity seems to me to miss the mark because its authors never understood at first hand what they criticize. The second moment is when we pass from appreciation to creative criticism. Such criticism must always begin from an inner grasp of the tradition. Then we become, in a measure, the makers of tradition, and affect the heritage which will be transmitted to our children. All this which, I suppose, is trite and obvious enough is directly applicable to religious tradition. There never was a religion which was evolved from the private inner consciousness of an individual, never one which did not live by a tradition which itself is living.

Even if we could attain to private judgment in the complete sense no rational man would desire it. Professor Radakrishnan has said well and simply: 'The importance of authority and the value of tradition are great. If we are not to lapse into individualistic rationalism and ultimate negation, if we are not to be led astray by our wandering whims, if our personal intuitions are to be guided by the accumulated wisdom of the race, only tradition can help us. Mankind does not begin afresh with each individual . . . Though religion is in a sense each individual's personal affair, it is dependent on past tradition and grows out of it. But loyalty to tradition is one thing and bondage to it quite another. Complete conformity is contrary to life. Only the dead are completely conforming.'[4]

What then do we mean by tradition when we are considering the Christian religion? We mean no doubt doctrines, but we mean much more. The Christian tradition is the whole continuous life of the Spirit which has been within the community of believers. But this life has partly expressed itself in doctrines,

[4] *Idealist View of Life*, pp. 78-79.

and in them we are compelled to recognize that there has been development. In the main two theories have been suggested by theologians to justify this development. On the one hand, there are those who conceive the process as dialectical. The whole faith was once for all delivered to the saints. The deposit was made in the beginning of the Church, and the subsequent evolution has been nothing more than the making explicit of what was before implicit. On the other hand, there are those who hold that the development of tradition is analagous to organic evolution. There is continuity, but it is like that between the acorn and the oak, the growth of life. Doubtless both these types of development can be exemplified in the history of Christian doctrine; but the second is the more fundamental. Christianity is the experience of God which is enjoyed by a community, and by a community which does not perish in a generation but stretches over the centuries, reproducing itself with differences which do not destroy its identity from age to age. The doctrines of the Church have the authority of that experience of God which is behind and within them. They are not primarily philosophical formulas, and their value does not depend on their logical coherence.

Two remarks must be made on the position which I have outlined. First, we cannot hold that there is any finality in the tradition which has come down to us. The fact that its content and expression have changed and that its purpose is not primarily theoretical but spiritual and religious warns us that the tradition, being living, must be modified by the passing generations.

Secondly, we cannot assume that every development of doctrine and the whole content of tradition is a legitimate expression of the creative life of the Spirit in the Church. Newman, as we all remember, drew up an elaborate series of tests to distinguish true developments from false. But in the end there is only one test. A development which is not in accordance with the mind of Christ is none of His. The tendency to perversion which dogs all spiritual movements can be guarded against by a constant return to the first creative moment of the Christian Church. Our quarrel with Rome is not that it has produced new doctrines—that might be a very good thing and necessary for the new times—but that its new doctrines are in contradiction with the spirit of the New Testament.

Here we arrive at the real contribution which Protestantism has made to the life of the Church, and at the same time the necessary and legitimate place of private judgment. The Church can never be free from the duty of testing the tradition by the mind of Jesus. It is the glory of Protestantism that it has pushed back through the traditions to the figure of Him upon whom tradition centres. It has desired with an unconquerable longing to see the historical Jesus as He really was. The Catholic Church can never be whole unless it contains within it the Protestant and his criticism of Christianity by Christ. It is the business of every Christian to apply this test and add by the power of the Spirit his mite to the treasury of the Church. Nor can the wider test of reason and conscience be omitted. Though doctrines are not philosophy, they have philosophical implications and are to some extent expressed in philosophical terms. It is of the nature of philosophy to become obsolete, and we have the task of reinterpreting the tradition and expressing its religious values in the currency of our generation.

But I would say in conclusion, ' all these worketh the one and self-same Spirit,' the Spirit which is in the Church. In the Protestant criticism and return to the New Testament it is the tradition which criticizes itself and reforms itself : it is the continuous life of the Church which renews itself by remembering from what and from Whom it came.

THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF THE REFORMATION

By Prof. R. B. Mowat.

AMONG the notable features of the Mediaeval Church were Authority, as embodied in the unbroken and undeviating tradition of the Church; the Latin tongue, common to all its educated members; and the possibility of a career, open to anyone, however lowly born, who attained the initial step of ordination.

It has often been said or suggested that the Reformation—or 'Protestant Revolution,' as Seebohm called it—struck a deadly blow at these three features. The facts of history, however, scarcely support this contention. The Reformation, certainly, was a blow at the principle of undeviating authority. In spite of the limitations of some of the early Reformers, and of the tyrannies of some of the early Reformed Churches, the Reformation was an assertion, however imperfect, of the right of private judgment. The first contention, therefore, is correct. The Reformation broke the extreme principle of Authority.

This cannot be said, however, of the other two features. The Reformation did not destroy the use of the common Latin tongue. This continued to be used by scholars, along with vernaculars, throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Even in the eighteenth century many scientific works were written in Latin; for instance, the celebrated series of 'Proceedings' called *Acta Eruditorum*. Dr. Arnold, when beginning work for an edition of 'Thucydides,' hesitated between the use of Latin or English for the 'notes' and the text. He decided in favour of English. This was about the year 1825. By this time the doom of Latin as the common tongue of the educated people of England was clear; but the Reformation cannot be blamed for this. The use of vernacular languages in written works was increasing before the Reformation, and was bound to spread owing to the invention of printing. The Reformation cannot even be said to have hastened the process.

As regards the other feature, the career open to talent, the Reformation may be said to have had a restrictive effect. None of the Reformed Churches, except the Church of England, offered a career comparable in respect of wealth, power and social position with that which the Mediaeval Church, or even the post-Reformation Roman Catholic Church, offered. Theoretically, in the Mediaeval Church a serf, if ordained, becoming free, could rise to be Pope, though none, I believe, ever did so; men of lowly birth did, however, attain to high positions. The Reformation, by dividing Western Christendom, restricted the geographical area, that is, the remaining Roman Catholic countries, in which a career to powerful and wealthy ecclesiastical positions were, in theory and to some extent in practice, open to all comers.

On the other hand, the Reformed Churches did, from one point of view, open the door wider to men of comparatively lowly birth than the Mediaeval Church or even the post-Reformation Roman Catholic Church. For in the Roman Catholic Church, down at any rate to the end of the eighteenth century, the common man who was ordained had to meet the competition of men who came from families of birth, wealth and influence. Within the Reformed Churches he had seldom, if ever, to face such competition. It was less difficult for a man of poor or middling parentage to become Archbishop of Canterbury after the Reformation than before. Macaulay has pointed this out in that wonderful third chapter of his *History* which describes English social life towards the end of the seventeenth century:

> 'The place of the clergyman in society had been completely changed by the Reformation. Before that event, ecclesiastics had formed the majority of the House of Lords, had, in wealth and splendour, equalled, and sometimes outshone, the greatest of the temporal barons, and had generally held the highest civil offices. Many of the Treasurers, and almost all the Chancellors, of the Plantagenets were bishops. The Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal and the Master of the Rolls were ordinarily churchmen. Churchmen transacted the most important diplomatic business. Indeed, all that large portion of the administration which rude and warlike nobles were incompetent to conduct, was considered as especially belonging to divines. Men, therefore, who were averse to the life of camps, and who were, at the same time, desirous to rise in the State, commonly received the tonsure. Among them were sons of all the most illustrious families, and near kinsmen of the throne, Scroops and Nevilles, Bourchiers, Staffords and Poles. To the religious houses belonged the rents of immense domains, and all that large portion of the tithe which is now in the

> hands of laymen. Down to the middle of the reign of Henry the Eighth, therefore, no line of life was so attractive to ambitious and covetous natures as the priesthood. Then came a violent revolution. The abolition of the monasteries deprived the Church at once of the greater part of her wealth and of her predominance in the Upper House of Parliament. There was no longer an Abbot of Glastonbury or an Abbot of Reading seated among the peers and possessed of revenues equal to those of a powerful Earl. The princely splendour of William of Wykeham, of Waynflete, had disappeared. The scarlet hat of the Cardinal, the silver cross of the Legate, were no more. The clergy had also lost the ascendancy which is the natural reward of superior mental cultivation. Once the circumstance that a man could read had raised a presumption that he was in orders. But in an age which produced such laymen as William Cecil and Nicholas Bacon, Roger Ascham and Thomas Smith, Walter Mildmay and Francis Walsingham, there was no reason for calling away prelates from their dioceses to negotiate treaties, to superintend the finances, or to administer justice. The spiritual character not only ceased to be a qualification for high civil office, but began to be regarded as a disqualification. Those worldly motives, therefore, which had formerly induced so many able, aspiring and high-born youths to assume the ecclesiastical habit, ceased to operate.'

As the sons of wealthy and high-born families ceased, with the Reformation, as a whole to become clergy in the Church of England, the field was left clear for members of less exalted but respectable families, whose sons by merit could rise to the highest stations. The Reformation episcopate—Hooper, Jewel, Hooker, Latimer, Parker, Grindal, Whitgift, Abbot, Andrewes, Laud and the rest—were all sons of yeomen farmers or small tradesmen or men of that rank. It is highly doubtful whether their ability and eloquence would have raised them to positions equally high in the undivided Mediaeval Church.

In the same way, through the absence of competition from the wealthy and noble-born, the Nonconformist Churches in Great Britain and the Reformed Churches on the Continent, offered positions of usefulness and respect to the smaller bourgeoisie. This fact, naturally, produced social as well as religious results. The cause of religion would obviously benefit from having so many pastorates supplied from industrious, honest, simple-living but independent bourgeois families; on the other hand, religious life would receive some disadvantage from the limitations or defects in the outlook of this class. I am not dealing, however, with religious results, but social results; it is therefore not the effects of the bourgeoisie on the Reformation, but of the Reformation on the bourgeoisie to which I wish to direct your attention.

I consider the rise of the bourgeoisie to be the central fact of modern history between the fall of the Roman Empire and the Revolution of 1848. The bourgeoisie are defined by André Siegfried as those who have reserves. They have something to fall back upon—a little capital, some education, a family tradition, a tenacious individualism. They are independent in outlook, because of their reserves; they are Liberal, because their position and its possibilities depend on the abolition or at least on the absolute control of privilege and monopoly. They steadily increased in power and influence from the later Middle Ages to the nineteenth century; the parliamentary, limited democracies of the Victorian Age, in Great Britain and on the Continent, and the grand literary, artistic and social achievements of that period, are the climax of bourgeois ascendancy. The bourgeoisie dealt more or less successfully with every problem except the prevention of war—war which, alas! they had used so often in their rise to power, but which in the end seems like to have ruined them and their magnificent civilization.

The bourgeoisie began before the Reformation. When the Roman Empire declined and fell, the ancient world, socially and economically based on slavery and large capitalism, passed away. Tribal agricultural societies took its place, with great instability in political, economic and social life. Gradually stable organizations were developed in what is roughly called the feudal age, hierarchies of classes held together by military and agricultural services. Town-life never completely disappeared from Central and Western Europe, but not until the twelfth century, or even later, do towns become a very notable feature of mediaeval life. Many different circumstances and conditions promoted town-life in the Middle Ages: the instinct for making and exchanging, which brought markets into existence; the desire of lords for lump-sums, which implied collective agreements; the need for protection, which drew families together within one ring-wall; the nucleus of a castle or monastery, with its numerous servants and craftsmen and its large local expenditure. Anyhow, wherever towns were to be found, there men of independent outlook, with instincts and sentiments of freedom, would be found too, and found collected together. Union made for strength; and in the later Middle Ages the towns of Europe were growing in wealth, population, capacity for self-govern-

ment and independent, progressive spirit. It was this class which welcomed the Reformation and which received the greatest impulse from Reform.

It was natural that the Reformation should appeal chiefly to townspeople. They lived near each other and could be brought together in meeting places. For the same reason, Reformed opinions spread easily in the mercenary armies of the time. Zwingli was a field-chaplain in the Swiss troops in the campaign of Marignano. Travellers brought rumours and reports of Reform to towns, and the new movement was discussed at markets. The universities were all in towns, and, however conservative they are, universities always contain some inquisitive spirits who take up the latest thing and bring it forth in a lecture or discussion. The University of Wittenberg had Luther, and the University of Orleans Calvin, but those were not the only university towns where Reform was in the air. Towns, too, had walls and could defend themselves, even against their sovereign; and could, like Geneva or Lausanne, drive out their Roman Catholic bishop if they had not already done so long ago. Thus, while the peasantry in the countryside, which was still as roadless and unlit as in the Middle Ages, remained superstitious and ignorant, and while the nobility remained bound to political interests or court policies, the bourgeoisie in North Germany, in England, Scotland, Scandinavia, in Poland even, Hungary, Transylvania, and to some extent in France, welcomed the new intellectual freedom of the Reform movement. It gave them just what, vaguely but yearningly, they had always been looking for—freedom from the weight of a settled and ordered social system which prevented their sons rising in the world; freedom from heavy ecclesiastical taxes which prevented them from accumulating capital for their business; freedom from antiquated usury laws which restricted or brought odium upon their investments; above all, freedom from the intellectual domination of priests who set definite bounds to their opinions when their own intellect, and perhaps their self-will and conceit, told them that they were able to think on many subjects and decide the issues of destiny for themselves.

Thus out of Reform came, if not a new, at any rate a vastly developed, social movement, the vast upward surge of the Euro-

pean bourgeoisie who are the makers of modern history. The bourgeois movement, however, was not restricted to town-dwellers; for, if the term bourgeoisie means 'those who have reserves,' it applies as much to the middling gentry of the country as to the propertied families of the towns. The substantial yeoman-farmer and the squire of a moderate-sized estate were essentially bourgeois in outlook; that is to say, they were economically independent, and so could dare to look a tyrant in the face; they had some education, and so, fortified by their independent spirit, were ready to throw off the intellectual shackles of priest and Pope; they had always had some part in local government, and so possessed a sense of their worth and position, and were determined to do away with class-monopoly and privilege. Latimer's famous sermon on the plough, preached for the Protestant King Edward VI, describes exactly that kind of bourgeois rural family on the eve of the Reformation which was to find in the Reformation its social and economic as well as its religious ideal:

> 'My father was a yeoman and had no lands of his own, only he had a farm of three or four pound by year at the uttermost, and hereupon he tilled so much as kept half-a-dozen men. He had walk for a hundred sheep; and my mother milked 30 kine. He was able, and did find the King a harness, with himself and his horse, while he came to the place that he should receive the King's wages. I can remember that I buckled his harness when he went unto Blackheath field.[1] He kept me to school, or else I had not been able to have preached before the King's Majesty now. He married my sisters with five pound, or twenty nobles apiece; so that he brought them up in godliness and fear of God. He kept hospitality for his poor neighbours, and some alms he gave to the poor. And all this he did of the said farm, where he that now hath it, payeth sixteen pound by year, or more, and is not able to do anything for his prince, for himself, nor for his children, or give a cup of drink to the poor.'

This sort of family, which in the Middle Ages was cramped and stunted by the overwhelming feudal and ecclesiastical systems, expanded in the free and invigorating air of the Reformation into the Puritan country gentry of England in the seventeenth century; into the Swedish captains and governors who maintained and extended the area of Western civilization in Northern Europe; and into the Prussian squires who were to be the pillars of a rising and formidable state down to the other day, and who even now have not entirely lost their solidarity and driving-power.

[1] Where the Cornish rebels were defeated in 1497.

The social and economic results of this rise of the town and country bourgeoisie, a rise which would not have occurred without the free conditions created by the Reformation, are the outstanding features of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In enumerating these results it is really impossible to distinguish social from economic. Banking, for instance, is an economic activity; but the class of banker, or the people with the accumulative and investing habit, is a social class, with definite ideals, an ethic, and social habits which no historian of society can overlook. This prominence of banking in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is one of the social-economic results of the Reformation. It is true that the chief bankers over the greater part of the sixteenth century were the Venetians and the Genoese; and the transfer of their predominance to the burgesses of Amsterdam, Hamburg and London may be ascribed to the discovery of the Americas and the ocean-route to India, rather than to the Reformation. The maritime discoveries by themselves, however, would not have given rise to modern banking had not the Reformation occurred and supplied the necessary legal and intellectual freedom; otherwise Spain and Portugal would have developed great banking centres, but they never did. The rise of the Bank of Amsterdam, of the Bank of Hamburg, the merchant-banking of Sir Thomas Gresham, took place within the century after the opening of the Reformation, and was the work of ardent Protestant burgesses. The Reformation may almost be said to have supplied the spirit, as well as the means, for prudent investment. Adam Smith wrote in the *Wealth of Nations*:

> 'It may be laid down as a certain maxim that, all other things being supposed equal, the richer the Church, the poorer must necessarily be, either the sovereign on the one hand, or the people on the other; and in all cases, the less able must the State be to defend itself. In several Protestant countries, particularly in all the Protestant cantons of Switzerland, the revenue which mostly belonged to the Roman Catholic Church, the tithes and Church lands, has been found a fund sufficient not only to afford competent salaries to the established clergy, but to defray, with little or no addition, all the other expenses of the State. The magistrates of the powerful canton of Berne, in particular, have accumulated, out of the savings from this fund, a very large sum, supposed to amount to several millions, part of which is deposited in a public treasure, and part of which is placed at interest in what are called the public funds of the different indebted nations of Europe.' [1]

[1] *Wealth of Nations*, Book V, Chapter I, Article III.

The Protestant canton of Berne was itself a banker. The Protestant republic of Geneva was the home of vigorous, cultured families, the persistent accumulators of fortunes which they invested and increased by merchant-banking. Of such families that of Necker in the late eighteenth century was a worthy type; rich, virtuous, public-spirited, simple, almost austere, yet living in refinement equal to that of any noble or prince. This kind of family, rich yet never ostentatious, public-spirited yet scarcely ambitious, refined yet never extravagant, humanitarian yet never radical, democratic yet never egalitarian, is found wherever Protestant principles have sunk deep into the people; it is found in Geneva and Berne; in the Huguenot families of Paris and Rouen; and in the Evangelical and in the Quaker families of the English mercantile communities.

The same feature—the rising power and self-consciousness of the Protestant bourgeoisie—led to the great plantation movement, the policy of overseas mercantile venture and settlement, which is another of the outstanding movements in modern history. The Roman Catholic countries, which remained aristocratic and feudal, shared very little in this movement. The great Spanish colonizing movement, for instance, was directed very largely by missionary zeal; it was the modern continuation of the mediaeval Crusades; or else it was merely a convenient way in which the Crown and its nobles could acquire new estates and receive rent-charges without either Crown or nobility leaving home. The Protestant overseas effort, on the other hand, had almost nothing of the missionary element about it, although the conversion of nations is sometimes piously inscribed as a policy in some of the Elizabethan and Jacobean charters. Froude, in his celebrated lecture called *The Sea-Cradle of the Reformation*, ascribes religious zeal, love of adventure, and the desire of bettering themselves to the squires' sons, farmers' sons and tradesmen's sons who were the overseas venturers of the Elizabethan Age. He writes:

> 'Individuals were left to their natural impulses. The Holy Office burnt English or French Protestants wherever they could catch them. The Protestants revenged their injuries at their own risk and in their own way, and thus from Edward VI's time to the end of the century privateering came to be the special occupation of adventurous honourable gentlemen who could serve God, their country and themselves in fighting Catholics. Fleets of these dangerous vessels swept the Channel, lying in wait at Scilly, or even at the Azores — disowned in public

> by their own Governments which secretly countenanced them, making war on their own account on what they called the enemies of God. In such a business, of course, there were many mere pirates engaged who cared neither for God nor man. But it was the Protestants who were specially impelled into it by the cruelties of the Inquisition. The Holy Office began the work with the *autos-da-fé*. The privateers robbed, burnt, and scuttled Catholic ships in retaliation. One fierce deed produced another, till right and wrong were obscured in the passion of religious hatred. Vivid pictures of those wild doings survive in the English and Spanish State Papers. Ireland was the rovers' favourite haunt. In the universal anarchy there, a little more or a little less did not signify. Notorious pirate captains were to be met in Cork or Kinsale, collecting stores, casting cannon, or selling their prizes—men of all sorts, from fanatical saints to undisguised ruffians.'[2]

All this is true enough, but the proportions are not correct. Froude makes too much of the religious and nationalist motives and recognizes only dimly the great social-economic motive—the urge of the rising urban and rural bourgeois families to find a place in the world for their sons, positions of reasonable wealth and activity in overseas venture. All the Elizabethan expeditions that Froude so graphically describes as anti-Spanish maritime raids were really mercantile undertakings with shareholders and prospects of profit or position.

In the point of view explained in the present essay, the Reformation has been regarded as a movement of intellectual and spiritual freedom which found its welcome and had its greatest effect in the most ambitious, tenacious, progressive and independent elements of the community, that is to say, in the bourgeoisie. They, and they alone, were ready to claim and to exploit, with a zeal that nothing could withstand, the right of private judgment; and it was because the ideals of the Reformation were really their own hitherto half-felt, half-expressed, never-satisfied ideals that under its influence they steadily went forward from this moment until they won all the chief influence and places in the economics, politics and, ultimately, in the society of Western and Central Europe. Because, in my view, the influence of the Reformation upon economics and society was primarily a spiritual and intellectual influence, a freeing, realizing, dynamic influence, I have passed by the material effects like the dissolution of the monasteries, the breaking up of clerical estates, and the transference of ecclesiastical property in land to lay hands. This transference, doubtless, was

[2] Froude, *English Seamen of the Sixteenth Century*, Lecture I.

very important, socially and economically. The landed gentry of England and Scotland, the *Junkers* of East Prussia, the Mecklenburg and Pomeranian squires, would not have been what they were in the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries without the dissolution of the monasteries. Doubtless, too, the enclosure of open fields, the decline of the small farmer and the yeoman, and the increase of the landless labourer were hastened by the changes in ecclesiastical property effected by the Reformation. This aspect of the Reformation is well-known; it deserves attention, though perhaps historians have tended to exaggerate it. In any case it is not the most important social and economic result; nor has the Reformation in this material sense set its mark on European society nearly so deeply as it has in what I have called its spiritual-intellectual sense. For to my mind the great efflorescence of Western civilization since about the year 1500, its prodigious contribution to commerce, science, politics, literature, and even to the arts of painting and music, is due not only, perhaps not primarily, to the Renaissance, but to that great release, that great emancipation of the mind of man which occurred when the later Mediaeval bourgeoisie dared to reject the ecclesiastical system of the last fifteen hundred years and claimed mind and matter and the whole universe as the sphere for their activity.

I will not say, however, that in order that this emancipation, this release of energy, should occur, it was indispensable that the Reformation should take place. I believe that such an emancipation and release could have taken place within the framework of the Catholic Church. The Roman authorities had always two alternative choices, down at any rate to the end of the Council of Trent in 1563. On the one hand, they could choose to retain the mediaeval system of a practically closed theology and of a definite limit upon the inquisitiveness and self-governance of the human mind; on the other hand, they could admit the Protestant claim to the right of private judgment, and could confess that error was conceivable in a tradition of even fifteen hundred years of age. If Europe gained immeasurably in one direction by the Reformation, it inconceivably lost in another. It gained the Liberal bourgeoisie; but it lost the prospect of that bourgeoisie and its ideals being accepted everywhere in Central

and Western Europe. The Reformation benefited society, but benefited it at the expense of a lasting and infinitely costly division. Henceforth every thinking citizen has to choose between retaining his power of independent judgment in a Protestant communion, or being a member of the greatest existing international organization, with its mighty tradition, its consoling sense of spiritual security, but through the sacrifice of his independent power of judgment.

About the time of the Vatican Council of 1870 and the discussions on Papal infallibility, the Jesuit champions of the Papal view had a phrase: *il sacrifizio del intelletto*, the first and last sacrifice which the good Catholic must make. It is a terrible result of the Reformation, of the division of Western society into Protestant and Roman Catholic, that such a choice between two so good and now irreconcilable systems should have to be made. Why should a man not be able to think and enquire as he pleases, and yet remain a member of the great historic church of Christendom? The greatest of the secession communions, the Church of England, the one which retained most of the organization and tradition of the Mediaeval Church, has managed to live and expand without inhibiting the right of private judgment, without repelling the ardent, independent, assertive and enquiring liberal-bourgeois spirit. The Roman Catholic Church could perfectly well have done so too, had it been led otherwise than it was; perhaps, also, if the Reformers had been more statesmanlike, more like Cranmer, in the sixteenth century. The Protestant secession gave Europe its Liberal bourgeoisie, with all their profound social and economic influences; but it also gave Europe wars of religion, and an enduring, pernicious division between the territories of Liberty and the territories of Authority. Paralysed by this catastrophic division, Europe gropes, physically divided, mentally perplexed. The Pope, in admirable allocutions, urges peace and moderation; the Protestant communion has a world alliance for peace through the churches; but the two never really join their effort. It is time that this false dichotomy of Western civilization shall stop. Yet I cannot see how this wholesome union is to come about until, as Archbishop Laud said when he was invited into the College of Cardinals, ' Rome be other than it is.'

THE REFORMATION & NATIONALITY

By Dr. Ernest Barker, Professor of Political Science in the University of Cambridge.

I.

'CHRISTIAN liberty, disengaging itself from the laws of a vast and Catholic Church that transcended nations and continents, found itself bitted and bridled by the absolutism of a petty Saxon lordling.' These are the words of a French writer, M. de Lagarde, in a work on *L'Esprit politique de la Réforme*. He is speaking of Lutheranism; but if we substitute for the 'petty Saxon lordling' the more grandiose figure of 'our only Sovereign Lord King Henry VIII,' the fable is narrated about ourselves, and Anglicanism too is touched.

I have cited these words, in the beginning of my argument, because they illustrate the dangers we may incur if we interpret the Reformation too readily in terms of nationality. To construe the Reformation as being the expression, in the sphere of religion, of a new and awakened national consciousness — this, under the conditions of the sixteenth century, in which the Prince was the incarnation of such national consciousness as existed, is to make a religious movement the child, and not only the child but the servant, of a political accident. M. de Lagarde, continuing his argument, adds, 'The new Churches which sprang from the Reformation received from political societies much more than they gave to them; and far from preceding them, still more from commanding them, they followed their development.' Shall we subscribe to this view? Was the Reformation, in any real sense, the child of politics?

II.

It is hardly to be denied that, in its essence, the Reformation was a new movement of the restless spirit of man, always seeking

Like as the waves make towards the pebbled shore

to find a more restful answer to the eternal question by which it is vexed, What shall I do to be saved? Contemporaries of the

Crusades spoke of them as a *novum salutis genus*: contemporaries of the Reformation might have described it, with even more justice, in the same terms. It was a spiritual revolt against a mediated religion, flowing through a mediating priesthood, along mediatory channels or conduits of sacramental grace: it was a movement towards an immediate religion, in which the believer was essentially his own direct priest, and grace passed straight from God to man if only man were justified, and cleansed into the new nature of a fit receptacle, by faith or by election. As such a movement, the Reformation was primarily a liberation of the human spirit, whatever the illiberalities into which it might subsequently fall in the tangled cross-currents of human affairs; it turned the parish of the mediaeval Roman Church (I quote the words of a Swiss scholar, Dr. Alfred Farner) 'from being a passive ecclesiastical group, subject to dues and obligations, the area of a priestly authority, into a community of men with a right of judgment and a capacity for action.' The transformation has not, indeed, been always or everywhere achieved. The idea of the area of priestly authority (*Kompetenzbezirk des Pfarrers*) dies hard in some of our English parishes. But perhaps we have not finished our English Reformation.

III.

This spiritual movement of liberation, as I have said, soon fell into a swirl of cross-currents. All religious movements, when they pass from the far and high country in which they are born into the busy world, must necessarily become complicated with other factors. There were three main factors with which the Reformation became complicated. It was coloured by each of the three, but we have to remember that it was in itself, and in its origin, independent of them all, and it cannot be peculiarly interpreted in terms of any. The first of these factors, which will concern us presently, is that of nationality. The second is that of the State, or political society. The State, in itself, is something different from the nation, though it may coincide, in its area, with the nation—as it did in some instances, though by no means in all, in the sixteenth century. The mark of a State, or political society, is the presence of a government possessing and exercising authority; and from this point of view we have to

notice that the Reformation became immediately complicated with the growing tendency of governments, which was already notable by the end of the fifteenth century, to enlarge their sphere, to assert their 'sovereignty,' and to proclaim their 'absolute' character. The Reformation, on the whole, aided this tendency, partly in a negative way, by attacking the spiritual authority of a mediating priesthood, which had hitherto stood over against the claims of secular authority; partly in a positive way, by proclaiming the doctrine of the total and complete authority of political government, 'in causes ecclesiastical as well as civil.' M. de Lagarde, fixing his attention on this particular complication, interprets the Reformation as the triumph of Ghibellinism, the victory of an anti-clericalism which overleapt itself, and fell on the other side in the morass of subjugation to a single and omnipotent secular-spiritual authority. This is to forget the intrinsic spirit of the essential Reformation, which was a spirit of liberation: it is also to forget other complications, which existed no less than the political complication —the national complication, which united the Reformation to the spirit of national independence: the social-economic complication, which united the Reformation to social-economic aspirations, and made it an ally, sometimes in its own despite, of movements of social-economic emancipation. We are brought, by the mention of this latter complication, to the third of the factors which impinged on the Reformation — that factor of social-economic classes, and of conflicting social-economic interests and ambitions, which Marxist theory has emphasized, and the actual conditions of our contemporary life, apart from theory, lead us all nowadays to recognize whenever we turn to the historical interpretation of the past. The Reformation fell upon a heaving social system of *Stände* or Estates—peasantry and bourgeoisie; nobility and princes; clergy both upper and lower. It affected that system, as that system affected it; and in interpreting Lutheranism, or Calvinism, or Anglicanism, we have to remember both the social philosophies they generated and the social consequences to which they unconsciously trended. But to follow some modern German thinkers, and to interpret the Reformation as the victory of the bourgeoisie and of capitalism, is to commit more than one mistake. It is to fix attention on

a particular complication, rather than on the Reformation itself: it is to forget other complications: it is, finally, to misinterpret even the particular complication. For a movement whose spirit was essentially a spirit of liberation cannot have entirely enured to the subjection of the proletariate.

IV.

Putting our point in another way, we may say that the Reformation, when it sought to organize itself in new Churches or ecclesiastical societies, as all religious movements must necessarily organize themselves for the sake of perpetuation, inevitably came in contact, and interacted both passively and actively, with three existing forms of society—national societies; political societies or States, sometimes coterminous with national societies, and sometimes not; and social groups and formations. Born in this multiplicity, the conception of the Church was never very definite in the age of the Reformation. There were initial and abstract problems, apart from the multiplicity of concrete facts and possible actual models. Was the true Church visible or invisible? Was it *ecclesia universalis*, or *ecclesia particularis*; or, if it was somehow both, what was the relation of the two? If the Church were visible and particular, what was to be its actual model or form? Was it as wide as a nation, and could it be therefore described as a National Church? Was it limited to a particular territory or *regio*, which was the area of a territorial political society; and should it therefore be called a territorial or State-Church? Or was a Church neither national nor territorial, but something else—a *collegium*, like other *collegia*, in the area of social groups and formations; and should it therefore be described as collegial?

So far as I can see, the last of these answers belongs, in the main, to the seventeenth century, when it was elaborated simultaneously in the thought of Dutch theologians, such as Gisbert Voet, and the practice of English Non-conformity. The visible and particular Church of the sixteenth century was either national or territorial—or something hovering between the two. It is difficult to be precise, because the thought of the sixteenth century was not precise on this point. To-day we should most of us distinguish between Nation and State, and we should there-

fore distinguish between a National Church and a State-Church, which are thus two separate conceptions. The Church of Scotland now calls itself, in Article III of the Schedule to the Church of Scotland Act of 1921, 'a national Church representative of the Christian faith of the Scottish people'; but if it calls itself a National Church, it would certainly repudiate any idea that it was a State Church. The distinction was less easy in the sixteenth century. Thinkers, writing in Latin, used the word *populus*, which may describe the people of a nation such as England, or the people of a territory such as electoral Saxony, or the people of a town such as Zurich. Not only so, but they identified the *populus* with the *respublica* or *civitas*, confusing, as a modern thinker might feel, the Nation with the territorial State. There is, we may say, an absence of our modern differentiations in Reformation thought about these matters.

Maitland has somewhere said that if we are to understand the Middle Ages, we must think ourselves back into a mediaeval haze. Perhaps it is also true that if we would understand the Reformation, we must think ourselves back into a Reformation haze. In that haze Nation, State and Church all seem to melt into one another, and to become one society. Men think in 'unitarian' terms of the one society; and herein they are only the heirs and legatees of the Middle Ages, which had equally thought in unitarian terms of the one society, the Christian Commonwealth or *Civitas-Ecclesia*, which was at one and the same time a Commonwealth or *Civitas* and a Church. Hooker is mediaeval, and more than mediaeval, in his unitarianism, when he writes that 'in a free Christian State or Kingdom, where one and the self-same people are the Church and the Commonwealth, God through Christ directing that people to see it for good and weighty considerations expedient that their sovereign lord and governor in cases civil have also in ecclesiastical affairs a supreme power; for as much as the light of reason doth lead them unto it, and against it God's own revealed law hath nothing —surely they do not in submitting themselves thereunto any other than that which a wise and religious people ought to do.' Here he identifies *populus*, *ecclesia* and *civitas*; and not only so, but he holds this one and self-same body to be governed by a single sovereign lord both as an *ecclesia* and as a *civitas*; while

the Middle Ages, even if they identified *ecclesia* and *civitas*, believed none the less in two separate governments, the secular and the clerical, each with its own separate sphere.[1]

We in England, with our peculiar gift for continuity, and our happy knack of living in the Middle Ages even in the twentieth century, have continued the ancient identification. If we tore ourselves away from mediaeval universalism in the sixteenth century, we none the less kept, and we continue to keep, mediaeval 'unitarianism' in the form of an identification of the English Commonwealth and the English Church. What is true of Anglicanism is also true, with some modifications due to peculiar circumstances, of Lutheranism, Zwinglianism and even Calvinism. For even Calvinism was 'unitarian': it issued, in Geneva, in a *Ville-Eglise*, a town which was also a Church; and it sought to issue, elsewhere, in a *Nation-Eglise*, a nation which was also a religious society. It is a departure from Reformation thought proper, which always tended to be unitarian, when at the end of the sixteenth century Melville enunciates in Scotland the Two Kingdom theory of the Commonwealth and the Church, and when in the seventeenth century, among Dutch dissidents and English Non-conformists, the doctrine of the two societies is preached and practised. In the thought of the Reformation proper the Church is one with the Commonwealth (in which, again, the Nation is one with the State), and there is an interfusion and interpenetration of ecclesiastical and secular society.

V.

I have allowed myself to be carried further than I had intended in the observations which I have just made about the ideas of the Reformation on the nature of ecclesiastical society

[1] See Stephen of Tournai, *Summa Decret.*, Introduction (quoted in Carlyle, *History of Mediaeval Political Thought in the West*, Vol. II, p. 198, n. 1). Stephen identifies *civitas* and *ecclesia*; but using the word *populus* to indicate a class or condition or 'estate,' rather than a people or nation(using it, as a German would say, to indicate a *Stand* rather than a *Volk*), he speaks of the two *populi* of the *laici* and the *clerici*, each with its separate *principatus*—the *regnum* in the one case, and the *sacerdotium* in the other, He thus assumes a single *civitas-ecclesia*, containing two 'estates' of men and two corresponding governments. Hooker uses the word 'people' as equivalent to Nation or Folk: he identifies it with the *civitas-ecclesia*, and he assigns a single *principatus* to the one *populus-civitas-ecclesia*.

and organization. What has emerged is simple, and it comes to this—that the Reformers believed that a *populus* was also an *ecclesia*, and an *ecclesia* also a *populus*; but the *populus* was not necessarily a nation, and it might be the people of a municipality, or the people of a territory, as well as the people of a nation. I must now shift the venue; and turning from consideration of the nation as a possible cadre of ecclesiastical organization, in the days when the fluid lava of the Reformation had to settle into a form, I will deal with a theme which strictly and logically I ought to have considered first—the influence of nationality, as a sentiment, in causing the original eruption of the lava. How far was the sentiment of nationality responsible for the general character of the Reformation as a whole? How far, again, was it responsible, in different countries and regions, for the particular characteristics of the Reformation in its several phases and episodes?

Let me begin with some general considerations. A race is a given physical fact of common anatomical structure. A State is a juridically created legal fact of common organization. A nation is an historically developed spiritual fact of common feeling and habits. Race, Nation and State are different facts, belonging to different orders; but in our modern life the spiritual fact of the Nation has increasingly become co-extensive with the legal fact of the State, and we live in a world of Nation-States. The sixteenth century was different in two respects from our own age. In the first place, the historical development of the nation was four centuries younger, and national consciousness, in days when the printing press had still a large work to do in uniting the thoughts of men, was still vague and groping. In the second place, the spiritual fact of the nation, so far as it existed, was very far from being generally co-extensive with the legal fact of the State. France and England might be described as Nation-States, with a definite national consciousness; Sweden became a national State, with the accession of the Vasa dynasty, in 1523; and Spain, though only recently united within, and now connected with the Habsburgs without, might merit the same appellation. But Switzerland was the loosest of confederations: Germany was a congeries of principalities: what we now call Holland and Belgium were counted indiscriminately as part of

Spain: Denmark and Norway were joined under the House of Oldenburg; and the House of Habsburg held disparate dominions, like a bundle of twigs, in its great grasping hand. How could nationality be a general driving force in such a world—especially when over it all there still loomed the shadow of the non-national and would-be universal Holy Roman Empire?

VI.

That very word 'Roman' is our clue. The Reformation as a whole, we may say, was nationalist, and inspired by a sort of incohate feeling of nationality, in that it marked a reaction of Northern and Teutonic Europe against the Southern tradition of Rome by which it had so long been over-shadowed. It may seem a facile, and even a trite, generalization to proclaim the Reformation as something of a Northern national revolt against Latinism; but we have to perpend the truth which may lie in the trite. The Middle Ages had accepted the rule of the Universal; but it was really a Latin universal which they had accepted. The challenge of the sixteenth century, on a large view, is a challenge to Latinism. Not that it was the Latinism of the Holy Roman Empire which was attacked. After all, the Empire had been domiciled in Germany: it was styled, in the language of the day, *Imperium Romano-Germanicum*; it might even be regarded as a Northern prize and asset. The real challenge was the challenge to the Latinism of the Roman Church, domiciled in Italy. Here we may see the play and the interaction of two converging forces. The first and the greatest of these was that force of which I have already spoken—the force of a spiritual revolt against a mediated religion and a mediating priesthood: the force of a spiritual demand for immediate religion and the direct priesthood of the believer. The second force, which I should call consequential and ancillary, is the nationalist revolt against the mediating priesthood as being in its heart and core Roman. To consider the scope and area of the Reformation is at once to recognize the existence of this second force as a concomitant presence strengthening the primary force of spiritual revolt. The Reformation in England is an assertion of Englishry against the bonds of Rome. In Switzerland, it is an assertion of Switzer feeling, speaking through the mouth of

Zwingli, patriot as well as evangelist, who believes in the autonomy of each ecclesiastical society, and holds that 'a society in one place, even if that place be Jerusalem itself, can give no command to a society in another.' In Germany Luther's three pamphlets of the year 1520 are significant: there is the *De Libertate Christiani*, which announces the essential doctrine of immediate religion and direct priesthood; there is the *De Captivitate Babylonica*, which preaches the revolt against Latinism; there is the appeal *An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation*, which illustrates the positive and nationalist aspect of this revolt. Even among the French Calvinists of the later sixteenth century, where we should hardly expect it, we find some anti-Latinism, and a certain Teutonic trend. Hotman was a civilian jurist, skilled in Roman Law; but he was also a Calvinist, and in his *Francogallia* he seeks to bring France back to her ancient Frankish and Teutonic origins.

VII.

It is a curious thing, to which we must necessarily refer because it seems to contradict our argument, that while the Reformation was carrying men in anti-Latin ways, there were two other contemporary movements—the Renaissance and the Reception —which seem to go in the opposite direction. The Renaissance, however, even if it began in Italy, and even if it had a zest for pure Latinity, was far from being a vehicle of Latinism when it spread to Germany and the Low Countries. On the contrary, it was a scholarly reaction against clerical scholasticism, which naturally went hand in hand with the religious reaction against the general clericalism of Latin Christianity; and again, from another point of view, it was far more charged with Hebraism and Hellenism — the return to original Hebrew and original Greek — than it was with the Latin influence. The Reception of Roman Law which marks the sixteenth century is a more difficult matter. How shall we explain the fact that Germany romanized her law at the very time when she was seeking to de-romanize her religion? And how shall we reconcile the contradiction that while in 1520 Luther was protesting against Babylonian captivity in religion, an ordinance of the Imperial Chamber in 1495, only a quarter of a century before, had marked the turn-

ing-point in the history of the installation of a Babylonian captivity in law? The same revolted peasants who appealed to the Reformation about 1525 appealed equally against what they called the 'Red-Welsh,' or foreign gibberish, of Roman Law: why were they forced to swallow an Italianate jurisprudence when they were being promised liberation from an Italianate religion? The answer seems to lie in the existence, the needs and the policy of the German territorial states. The governments of those states drew their officials from the ranks of civilians trained in Roman Law: they found in that law the Caesarian and centralist principles which suited their policies; and they adopted Roman Law in the same breath that they rejected the Roman Church. Both actions served their book: they were strengthened equally by the ejection of a Roman clergy and the installation of a Roman-law bureaucracy. The tragedy of the *Deutsche Nation* was that it was hardly a nation, and far less a national State, but only a congeries of principalities; and the princes did after their kind. Thus Germany lost, for centuries to come, what national law she had, and she failed to find, in spite of the national fervour of the early Reformation, the expression of national life which a national Church might have given.

VIII.

Besides the element of nationality which is contained in the Northern or Teutonic reaction against Latinism, there is another element, which may almost be called by the name of induced nationality. This is the element derived from the study and imitation of the life of the Jewish nation, as recorded in the Old Testament. The example of the Jewish nation is a recurrent theme in the literature of the Reformation, and the Hebraism of the sixteenth century may almost be counted as a form of nationality—a form which re-appeared in our English Commonwealth of the next century. Each of the Reformed peoples is encouraged to regard itself as a new Israel, a chosen people, directly covenanted with God. There is a striking expression of this idea in the *Vindiciae contra Tyrannos* of 1579, with its doctrine of the double covenant—the covenant of the people with God, even as Israel covenanted with Jehovah: the covenant

or compact of king and people, even as David made a covenant with the elders of Israel in Hebron. But the idea had found earlier expressions than that in the *Vindiciae contra Tyrannos*. Luther and Calvin had both gone back to the Hebrews and the nation and polity of Israel; and Martin Bucer had said that 'the political order and the law of the children of Israel appeared as so excelling, that a Solon or Plato, or even an angel, could not have imagined them.' Even if the Hebraism of the Reformation can only be called an induced or imitative form of nationality, it can hardly be left out of our reckoning in any discussion of the connection between the Reformation and nationality.

IX.

I have spoken of nationality in general, in its bearing on the general character of the Reformation as a whole. Some few words may be added about the influence of nationality on the particular characteristics of the Reformation in different countries and regions. I will only take three cases—those of Germany, France, and our own country. There was an obvious element of nationality in the German Reformation, particularly in its beginning; but there were no less obvious elements of another order—the element of an Empire which was supra-national, but comparatively weak, and that of territorial principalities which were infra-national, but strong; and the particular characteristics of the German Reformation, as it settled down on the lees, were more dependent on the territorial principality than on the *Imperium Romano-Germanicum* or the *Deutsche Nation*. Nationality hardly affected the Reformation in France; or to speak more exactly (for after all there was a connection) we may say that the Reformation in France was definitely anti-national. It was an attempt of Huguenot churches to contract out of the national body of France, and to form exempt and autonomous political communities; and the ally of this attempt was the particularist tendencies of feudal nobles and powerful cities, particularly in the South of France. As early as 1561 there is a sort of Presbyterian State attempted in Upper Guyenne; after the massacre of St. Bartholomew, in 1572, the movement is accentuated. Hotman may attempt to preserve, or to

reinterpret, French national unity, by carrying it back to a Frankish and Teutonic past supposed to be more congruous with Huguenot needs; but a truer exponent of the genius of the Huguenot cause is the author of the *Vindiciae contra Tyrannos*, who regards a province, or even a city, as potentially a separate *populus*, which has its own contract to keep with God, and its own position and rights in regard to the king. The Reformation failed in France because it was an anti-national force in a highly national country, though we must add that it was interpreted by the Government of Louis XIV as being more anti-national than in his reign it actually was.

All of us here have probably our own views about the influence of nationality in our English Reformation. I have already spoken of an assertion of Englishry against Latinism; and I should stick to that saying. The Reformation was an ejection from the national body of the 'Red-Welsh' of an Italianate canon law and the Italianate clerical government behind that law; and national sentiment was behind the ejection. But I would add a qualification. It was Henry VIII who said, 'This Realm of England is an Empire'—an independent Empire. It was Henry VIII who said, 'This Realm of England is a Church'—an independent Church. There is what I should call *Etatisme*, as well as nationalism, in our English Reformation; and in the beginnings there is more *Etatisme* than nationalism, though there was always some nationalism there. In other words the English Church began as a State Church rather than a national Church; but in the course of time that position was gradually changed and inverted. I should say that it became a national Church when its direction passed over from the hands of the King to the hands of Parliament, which is a national organ, and makes national what it touches. Since I should date that passing over in 1660, I should date a national Church in England from 1660—not but what I should admit that we had already gone a long way towards a national Church in the reign of Elizabeth and the theory of Hooker.

X.

My theme has been the Reformation and nationality; but I must add one word about the Reformation and internationalism.

The Reformation was a revolt against Latin universalism; but it was not altogether a revolt against Universalism in itself. Besides Latin universalism there is what we may call a Pauline universalism, which, if we trace its secular origins, goes back to the Stoics—the idea of the single society of all mankind, with its single eternal and immutable law, which is the law of nature and of nature's God. The wedding of the Reformation to particular societies — cities, territories, kingdoms, nations — did some harm to this great and pure Universalism: it tended to throw men back on the particular, the positive, the enacted particular rule of the separate particular society. But universalism did not die. Zwingli, for example, might believe in the autonomy of the particular Church; but he also believed in a 'sensible' or visible Church Universal. Nor was the age of the Reformation, in actual fact, an age of separate and divided confessions. The Reformation of the sixteenth century long continued to be one in sympathy, and with all their differences there was a contact and a unity among the Reformers. The peoples as well as their leaders had a sympathy with one another, a sympathy that was often translated into practical charity. The fourth and last *Quaestio* which is raised in the *Vindiciae contra Tyrannos* is the question 'whether neighbouring princes rightly may, or should, give aid to the subjects of other princes who are afflicted in the cause of true religion or oppressed by manifest tyranny?' The answer given by the author to this difficult question is 'Yes'; and this was the answer given later by Gustavus Adolphus. It is true that Gustavus was also moved by national Swedish interests (perhaps he would have done wrong in acting at all if those interests had not also been present): but the Wars of Religion, in spite of a large admixture of political motives, and in spite of there being wars, had always elements of religious internationalism.

XI.

At the end of my discourse I would ask permission to make one observation, which transcends the history of the sixteenth century, on the larger and graver aspects of the relations of religion and nationality. Some may well feel that religion is universal, and nationality particular; and that the two can never

be wedded. This, I imagine, is the argument of the convinced Catholic, or ardent universalist. But there are things to be said on the other side. In the first place, the relation of the universal to the particular is not that of exclusion, but rather of inclusion. We cannot reconcile identity with difference by saying that the one shuts the other out. In the second place, the universal presented to men by the Catholic Church as it stood in 1500 was not a pure universal. It was coloured: it was, in a way, national; it was, as I have said, a Latin universal. If the Reformers projected nationality against Rome, and in so far as they did so, they were answering one sort of nationality by another. In the third place, I cannot but feel that the interfusion and interpenetration of nation and religion, of nationality and Christianity, if it can be achieved, is a high and worthy thing. To lift a true and genuine nation to the measure of being also a religious society is to do good both to the nation and to the religious society. It places religion in the heart of a warm and intimate national society: it consecrates that society by giving it something more than merely secular hopes and ambitions. Europe long lived on an old tradition of universalism; and it was living on that tradition in 1500. But the tradition did not square with the facts of actual life: it was the tradition of a Roman Empire, translated into a Roman Church, which belonged to a past that Europe had transcended, or at any rate left. So far as the Reformation carried religion to the nation, or the nation to religion, it was building on the living present. That present, so far as the fact of the nation goes, is still our present; and I, for one, would still live in a house built upon it, provided that it is willing to be the basis of the house. To say these things is to assume a fundamental principle—the principle that religious faith is a growing thing, and that a growing faith may choose the vestment it wears, and the house it inhabits, according to its own growth and the general growth of human life and society. If you accept a fixed faith, and a fixed organization interlocked with it, as the organization of the Roman Church is interlocked with its sacramentalism, you will not accept what I have said. If, again, you believe that the nation is not a healthy part of the general growth of human life and society, you will not believe what I have just been saying about its connection with religious faith. But if you

accept the idea of a growing faith in a growing world, and if you regard the nation as a healthy part of our general growth, you may agree that the connection between the Reformation and nationality—though it was only one of the connections of the Reformation, and though it was not always or everywhere close—was not a mistake in the sixteenth century, as its perpetuation is not a mistake to-day. And then you will say of the Church of England (*mutatis mutandis*, which only means the alteration of two words) what the Scots have said of the Church of Scotland, 'As a national Church representative of the Christian Faith of the English people it acknowledges its distinctive call and duty to bring the ordinances of religion to the people in every parish of England through a territorial ministry.' In a word, whatever you think of the principle and practice of a State-Church, you will continue to believe in a National Church (which is a separate idea)—though you may also (as I should) cherish the feeling that a national parliament should on some scheme—say, for example, the Swedish, which is worthy of consideration—continue to be connected with the fortunes and destinies of the National Church.

THE REFORMATION AND THE SCIENTIFIC MOVEMENT OF TO-DAY

By the Right Rev. E. W. Barnes, Sc.D., D.D., F.R.S.,
Bishop of Birmingham.

IN 1909 a series of essays was published under the title *Darwin and Modern Science*, to commemorate the centenary of Charles Darwin's birth and the fiftieth anniversary of the publication of *The Origin of Species*. To this volume Höffding, the distinguished Danish religious philosopher, contributed an appreciation of the influence of the conception of evolution in modern philosophy. In this essay he said :

> 'In accentuating the struggle for life Darwin stands as a characteristically English thinker: he continues a train of ideas which Hobbes and Malthus had already begun. Moreover, in his actual views as to the conception of species he had English forerunners; in the Middle Ages Occam and Duns Scotus, in the eighteenth century Berkeley and Hume. In his moral philosophy he is an adherent of the school which is represented by Hutcheson, Hume and Adam Smith. Because he is no philosopher in the stricter sense of the term, it is of great interest to see that his attitude of mind is that of the great thinkers of his nation.'

I draw attention to this passage because it shows how an acute and learned foreign observer finds a unity in our national approach to some fundamental problems which confront humanity. The great movements of thought and feeling which we know as Scholasticism, the Renaissance, the Reformation and the Age of the Enlightenment were international. But each nation had its own particular reaction to the ideas which influenced Western Europe as a whole. The Scientific Movement of to-day is world-wide : but its effect on the thought of particular peoples is determined by something peculiar to the mental character of each.

Not only is there some element apparently common to, and continuous within, the minds of the great thinkers of a nation : but we see within the nation the same oppositions persisting from generation to generation. And further, the emotional consequences of such oppositions change but slowly. Again and again within our race there has appeared independent religious

thought, impatient of tradition, in combination with wide social sympathies: against such thought and sympathies we may set a rigid, and doubtless quite sincere, religious and social conservatism eager to maintain the established social order and traditional modes of thought. The opposition between Wycliffe and his Lollard preachers on the one hand, and reaction as it ultimately triumphed under the Lancastrian kings and Archbishop Arundel on the other, has reappeared again and again. It showed itself rather more than half a century ago, when Colenso, in whom Biblical views, which no one dares challenge to-day, were joined to chivalrous sympathy for the Zulu race, was charged with heresy and deposed by Gray, the Metropolitan of South Africa. Modernists should remember that such opposition between new truth and conservative obscurantism still persists. The toleration at present extended somewhat grudgingly to Modernists may at any time be replaced by persecution. The debates at home on the Colenso case, says the author of a short notice of Gray in the Dictionary of National Biography, 'do not give a very high idea of the intellectual power of the bishops'; yet it is precisely to an intellectual understanding by the bishops of the issues at stake in any particular controversy that Modernists in the English Church must be able to trust, if they are to receive sympathy and justice when the next clash occurs.

Such reflections are by no means irrelevant to my subject to-day. Always it has been new knowledge or progressive enquiry or the consequent change in speculative thought which has led to religious dissensions in the past. In this age of amazingly rapid scientific progress and of free critical thought, we must expect an especially rapid alteration in religious belief. While such alteration and the consequent new orthodoxy are being established, the turmoil will be great: and many a Modernist will have to endure opposition or undeserved neglect before the cause for which he labours is victorious.

It is a mental characteristic of the Englishman, only partially shared by the Scotsman, to distrust elaborate systems of thought, and to argue empirically from observed facts. With this habit there goes an opposition to absolutist claims of authority, and an especially strong dislike of those who would quote general principles that they may pretend knowledge while they

conceal ignorance. Our national characteristics appeared with admirable clearness in the writings of Roger Bacon. In the thirteenth century, when Aquinas was giving in his *Summa* what he termed a brief compendium of the Christian religion—it contained some two and a half million words—Bacon was laying down principles by which men of science and philosophers can rightly be guided. As Adamson pointed out, Bacon repudiated a mode of argument which is perhaps not even yet extinct: 'This is affirmed by our superiors: this is the customary opinion: this is the popular view: therefore it must be admitted.' Against such a standpoint Bacon firmly protested and, as Adamson insisted, such a protest meant absolute revolt against the whole spirit of scholasticism. Here is a typical Baconian sentence which might have come this year from Ripon Hall: 'Authority may compel belief, but cannot enlighten the understanding.' Having thus swept aside all religious philosophy based on authority, Bacon had to find a new basis for speculative thought. That basis is the fundamental postulate of those who to-day would end the friction between religious feeling and the modern scientific movement: 'The end of all true philosophy is to arrive at a knowledge of the Creator through knowledge of the created world.' I must not refer to other aspects of Bacon's pregnant thought. But in an age when the idea of God as the Supreme Mathematician meets with no little approval, it is interesting to remember that Bacon called mathematics both 'the gate and key of the natural sciences' and also 'the alphabet of philosophy.' Mathematics is an instrument more or less needed in all branches of science, but it is particularly necessary and useful for the investigation of non-biological problems. 'Physicists,' said Bacon, 'ought to know that their science is powerless unless they call in the aid of mathematics.' Such thoughts came from the brain of an Englishman who died, after much persecution, some two centuries before Erasmus was born. At the time when Bacon was living Thomas Aquinas was gravely discussing 'whether an angel can be in more than one place at one and the same time' and 'whether more angels than one can be in one and the same place at the same time.' Between the manner of thought of Roger Bacon and Aquinas there was an opposition which still exists.

Almost inevitably the *Summa* of Aquinas provoked the criticism of the foremost English—ought I to say British?—thinkers of the beginning of the fourteenth century. Neither Duns Scotus nor Occam had Roger Bacon's insight. Bacon recognized the necessity for experiment, for observation at first hand, and had a clear appreciation of the true nature of scientific verification. But, though Duns and Occam had no such clear understanding, they each recognized that between traditional orthodoxy and philosophy as they would develop it there was an *impasse*. Duns therefore based dogma entirely on the authority of the Church. He denied the possibility of rational theology and held that all dogmas were alike undemonstrable. Of course, if God be omnipotent and absolutely free, so that He need not be consistent, and even the distinction between good and evil merely depends upon His will, anything may happen. Duns on such assumptions could accept all that was authoritatively taught by the Church. William of Occam, who seems to have died almost exactly in the middle of the fourteenth century, widened the road built by Duns and left the way clear for general theological scepticism. At the basis of his nominalism was insistence on the fact that in logic we deal with terms and prove nothing as to the relation of these terms to reality. Perhaps, alike in this position and in that of Duns Scotus, we are right to discover the irritation of men who, on the one hand, were bound to accept a set of dogmas in which they privately disbelieved and who, on the other hand, were divorced from that first-hand study of the created world which for Bacon led to a knowledge of the Creator.

In the middle of the fourteenth century the Black Death ravaged England; and the great spiritual leader who survived that calamity was John Wycliffe. The popular use of his name to-day has led to the widespread and quite mistaken belief that he was what we should now term a narrow, old-fashioned Evangelical. Wycliffe was, of course, the foremost Oxford philosopher of his time, the ornament and pride of his University. But he was more. When one reflects upon the age in which he lived, his mental audacity appears amazing. In the last years of his life he even hit out at transubstantiation. With clear theological insight there also went social sympathy. His 'poor

preachers' gave rational religion to the people and thus challenged the superstitions purveyed by the mendicant orders. Within a generation, as we know, Lollardy was suppressed. But the Lollard spirit survived. When opportunity occurred, it flamed out at the Reformation. We are its children.

Sometimes I amuse myself by trying to make a list of three men whom, since the close of the New Testament, our own age should judge to have shown the finest theological insight. Such insight involves the rejection of fable and false dogma, for all untruth obscures the knowledge of God. This fact eliminates great names. Thus, for example, Augustine is ruled out, since he solemnly asserted that in two years no less than seventy miracles had been wrought by the body of St. Stephen. The finest originality I would assign to the man who could detect false assertion and false dogma at a time when they were backed by apparently unchallengable authority. In any such list as I have described Wycliffe would find a place. He had great ability, a brave spirit, and the genius which enables a man to reject prevailing error. I would myself class Roger Bacon with Wycliffe, and with them I should associate Peter Abelard, whose exposition of the atonement must place him amid the greatest of clear-sighted theologians.

Wycliffe died. His followers were persecuted and suppressed. During the fifteenth century there was, alike in England and in Western Europe, a steady decay of religion. Much outward ecclesiastical magnificence and, in particular, the building of fine churches, co-existed with scepticism and corruption. Meanwhile the Renaissance paved the way for the Reformation. We can safely agree with Lecky that

> 'the true causes of the Reformation are to be found in the deep change effected in the intellectual habits of Europe by that revival of learning which began about the twelfth century in the renewed study of the Latin classics, and reached its climax after the fall of Constantinople in the diffusion of the knowledge of Greek and of the philosophy of Plato by the Greek exiles.'

The Renaissance, of course, did not merely give to the world Greek literature and Platonic philosophy. It created new habits of thought. Under its influence men felt the thrill of spiritual emancipation. The shackles of ecclesiastical authority, with its dogmas, its puerilities, its superstitions, its arrogance, fell away. Almost inevitably the moral standards which the Church had

striven to maintain were ignored. The Princes and Popes of the Renaissance, while the movement was at its height, enjoyed life, free action and free thinking, with the zest of a Hellene of the fifth or sixth century before Christ. The pretence of piety was dropped. The world was shamelessly immoral. It was cruel, though cruelty increased when it was later dedicated to the aims of religious fanaticism. But the era must have had an intoxicating glory of its own. Though life was fierce and short, it was varied and full. Men associated the restraints and inhibitions of ecclesiastical morality with intellectual bondage. From superstitions that had been gross and absorbing they had won freedom.

How will you judge the Renaissance? The answer will depend upon whether you are repelled by its cynical immorality or attracted by its intellectual adventurousness. What I personally lament is the reaction which almost inevitably followed its moral degradation. If we could have had men like Colet, Erasmus and More leading the world to pure religion and clean living, Western Europe might have retained intellectual freedom as moral order was re-established. But Reformation and Counter-Reformation quickly followed the Renaissance; and the great groups were each eager, not for freedom, but for some special dogmatic system. During the long war between Protestant and Papalist, freedom and truth alike suffered. In the end, happily, that liberty of private judgment, to which the Reformers were of necessity committed, made Protestantism the foster-mother of science. But the great Reformers, though Erasmus had clearer vision, were for the most part unconscious of the wider issues of the struggle.

Protestantism was, however, fortunate in that it never produced anything so lamentably successful as either the Jesuit system or the Council of Trent. The one within Catholicism replaced conciliation by warfare and committed the Roman Church to cruelties of which even now it refuses to repent. On the other hand, the Council of Trent, at a time when the teaching of the Church was obviously out of harmony with the intellectual condition of Europe, elaborated and hardened dogmas which the rational mind will never again accept. We can find sad instances of cruel persecution by Reformers in power: but

we can find no heirs of the Reformation to-day who would defend such conduct. We can similarly find, in the teaching of Luther and of reputable Anglican divines, beliefs as astonishing and absurd as are many dogmas of the Tridentine divines. But, because we are heirs of the Reformation, we claim the liberty to repudiate beliefs which are outgrown, even though the Reformers held them. On the other hand, a Church which is fettered by the claim of infallibility, must, when its errors become obvious, writhe in an evasion which can never be wholly successful.

As Modernists we differ in many things; but I take it that all among us agree that there can be no permanent dualism of faith and reason, no final opposition between theology and knowledge. In the end, unless reason is overwhelmed by the decay of civilization, it must triumph. Unfortunately, we are suspected by many of our ultra-Protestant brethren because they forget that, while heirs of the Reformation, they are also heirs of the Renaissance. Their birthright is not acceptance of the Bible as interpreted by Luther or Calvin or Milton or Wesley. If they did but know it they have a far more splendid heritage, a faith guided and sustained by reason. Theirs is the right of private judgment. They can always freely interrogate nature and history, enquire into and criticize the deepest longings and aspirations of man. In freedom they can reach conclusions—and, of course, make mistakes. It is, doubtless, much to be regretted that men should make mistakes. For this reason humility is to be commended as a virtue to all who pass from observation and experience to speculative theory. Only the rash man will set his conclusions in opposition to those of men wiser and of truer insight than himself. But the human race by the struggle between speculation and criticism grows in wisdom and understanding. Individuals and communities alike, when civilization is progressive, increase in knowledge of the truth. In our own civilization error and superstition should only survive when overweening confidence, formulated as infallibility, interposes a fatal barrier to progress.

The scientific movement, which is the chief glory of our era and for which the present age will remain famous in human history, is founded upon the free and unfettered search for truth.

The man of science acknowledges in his own sphere no authority but human reason. He tests all things and holds fast those which he deems true. He neither makes nor admits any claim to infallibility. If, by reason applied to observation or experiment, some other man can prove any theory which he has accepted to be either false or inadequate, he either rejects or modifies that theory. As a man of science, he is not directly concerned with metaphysical or theological speculation. But naturally, if the range of his interests is wide, he will only too probably be led more or less definitely to create some scheme of the universe to explain or embrace alike his moral consciousness and those deeper and hardly describable emotions which we term spiritual. If the man of science has true humility — and the pursuit of science does not encourage confident dogmatism—he will allow that his scheme of faith is probably imperfect. But he will uncompromisingly refuse to allow any critic to condemn it on the ground that it conflicts with some body of teaching asserted to be authoritative. The man of science, in short, rejects all authority save that of human reason. He claims the right of private judgment. He is a child of the Reformation.

One would have expected that, although the Roman Church would resent such new scientific knowledge as made cherished dogmas seem untrue and even absurd, yet non-Roman divines would since the Reformation have been generous to new ideas and friendly to intellectual progress. What we do find is that in both ecclesiastical camps voluble reactionaries have during the last four centuries condemned scientific discoveries that conflicted with traditional Christian beliefs. History yields, however, a modicum of comfort. While on the Roman side there has been the appearance of unanimity in the denunciation of newly-won truth, among members of Reformed Churches there have always been some men of eminence, and occasionally men of the highest eminence, who have refused to join in noisy condemnation.

The first quarrel between science and theology arose, of course, out of the heliocentric hypothesis which Copernicus put forward in A.D. 1543. As he was on his death-bed when his book was published, he escaped persecution. For a time his theory was ignored by Rome, possibly because Osiander's preface to

the book conveyed the suggestion that the new view was paradox rather than truth, though it may be that such tolerance as Nicholas of Cusa enjoyed had not entirely vanished. But the heliocentric position was condemned by Luther, who cogently pointed out that Joshua commanded the sun and not the earth to remain still. Melanchthon said that it was neither honest nor decent publicly to set forth such new notions. Calvin quoted the obvious verse: 'He hath made the round world so sure that it cannot be moved'; and asked, 'Who will venture to put the authority of Copernicus above that of the Holy Ghost?' But in the controversy little harm was done by the Reformers, save to their own posthumous fame.

The Roman Church, however, when it took tardy action burnt its fingers badly. A beginning was made when that queer brilliant creature Giordano Bruno was sent to the stake in 1600. But it was not until Galileo in 1610 turned the newly-discovered telescope to Jupiter and revealed its moons that the Copernican theory ceased to be a hypothesis and Rome was seriously alarmed. Then followed the amazing persecution, with threats of torture, of the foremost man of science in Europe. In 1616 Galileo appeared before the Inquisition and promised that he would neither hold, teach nor defend the Copernican hypothesis. In 1632, in his seventieth year, a prisoner and on his knees, he was made to abjure, curse and detest the error and heresy of the movement of the earth. In the year that Galileo died Newton was born. In the latter part of the seventeenth century intelligent Roman Catholics began to abandon the idea of a fixed earth. It was no stumbling block to the speculative orthodoxy of Pascal, and the easy-going Catholicism of Alexander Pope allowed him to eulogise Newton. Newton's *Principia* finally established the Copernican hypothesis. Those books asserting it which had been placed on the Roman Index were, by the authority of the Pope, removed from condemnation in the year 1835.

So far as I can discover, the Church of England went on its way unperturbed by the speculations of Copernicus and by the discoveries of Kepler and Galileo. Individual divines wrote and spoke foolishly. But for the most part there was indifference. Newton's discoveries appealed so strongly to national

pride, and men's minds had been so well prepared for the conclusion which they established, that they provoked little outcry from theological obscurantists. He was, as all know, buried in Westminster Abbey. A century and a half later Darwin was laid beside him.

I have spoken at some length of the Copernican hypothesis and its reception by the Churches inasmuch as the question as to whether the earth is the fixed centre of the universe was the only scientific issue raised at the time of the Reformation. Of course, in the sixteenth century erroneous beliefs were common. Reformers and their opponents alike believed in witchcraft, and that mental disease was caused by demoniacal possession, and that comets were specially sent as a warning of calamity, and that the world was literally made in six days, and that the Creation took place some six or eight thousand years ago. Each would have been scandalized by Darwin's theory that the apes and man had a common ancestor. Little significance, however, is to be attached to these facts. The beliefs were universal. What mattered was the sort of reception which should be given to those who in due course should challenge such generally accepted opinions. Who were best prepared to accept the appeal to reason when it should be made, the Reformers or their Papal opponents?

Now, although scientific enquiry was in its infancy, yet in one momentous dispute the appeal to reason had been made. I allude, of course, to the controversy with regard to transubstantiation. The range of the controversy was only equalled by the bitterness to which it gave rise. But in it was involved an issue of primary importance: should men associate the Divine presence with order or with miracle? The Catholic stood for the miracle of the Mass. He could point, so it was asserted, to a significant happening at Bolsena as an especially miraculous corroboration of the ordinary miracle. He had a theory of the whole matter developed with elaborate ingenuity by Aquinas. On the other hand, the doubts and denials of the Reformers went back to Wycliffe. At bottom they were concerned with the most important religious question that man can propound: how is God's grace received? The Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist involved a miraculous change in the substance of bread and wine

at consecration, so that with what still appeared to be bread and wine there was henceforth the real presence of Christ. The elements thus became His body and His blood. As against such theory and belief various views were put forward by different Reformers. They, unfortunately, had neither the methods nor the language of modern experimental religious psychology. We to-day say smoothly that, if the alleged spiritual change has taken place, there must be someone by whom it can be spiritually perceived. Failing the production of that person, we disbelieve the assertion. As in the fairy tale, if no one can perceive the Emperor's clothes, we conclude that the Emperor is naked. But such a development of experimental method is so recent that even now it shocks many people: it was outside the realm of ideas in which the Reformers moved. Hence many of them found it hard entirely to renounce tradition. Luther fumbled with consubstantiation. Calvin only reached his final opinions after a series of oscillations. The Anglican Reformers, though emphatically rejecting transubstantiation, were indefinite. Zwingli knew his own mind and so ultimately did Cranmer, who spoke of the idea of the Real Presence in the consecrated elements in a manner that no Catholic can forgive. But all the Reformers were instinctively rejecting the theory that change occurs in a material object although such change cannot be perceived: all were instinctively asserting the fact of God's direct communication of Himself to the human soul. If they had had available the language of modern psychology they would have said that the sacrament provides the external setting by which the process of association operates: through that process a particular type of spiritual experience can be obtained. Needless to say, the Reformers asserted, and we agree, that such experience can also be obtained otherwise.

It was, of course, unfortunate that the dominant issue at the Reformation thus belonged to a difficult region of religious psychology. On more simple issues the appeal to reason and fact would have been easier. But the appeal to reason was actually made. Authority at its most impressive was challenged by men who asked whether the facts of experience warranted the assertions to which assent was demanded. And, moreover, the issue was far larger than eucharistic doctrine. It involved

the enquiry as to whether the Church could give to its priests miraculous spiritual powers which others could not acquire or possess. When the Reformers replied in the negative to this enquiry they gave the answer of rational religion; and they made possible that harmonious union between science and religion for which we are still struggling.

In the history of the struggle two men call for special mention. At the opening of the seventeenth century Francis Bacon with his *Novum Organon* and *Advancement of Learning* showed genius in his understanding of scientific method and prophetic inspiration in his enthusiasm for truth. His failures, moral and intellectual, were surprising; but, though they damaged his reputation, they ought not to be allowed to minimize the positive value of his work. Later in the same century came Descartes, mathematician and philosopher. He remains a modern of the moderns, the mode of his thinking that of our own era. It is not easy to realize that he lived at a time when he felt forced to relinquish his most ambitious work that he might preserve peace with the Roman Church.

As I survey, on the one hand, the present state of the Churches and, on the other hand, the postulates which underlie the scientific movement of to-day, I see no reason to expect a reunion in which Catholic and Reformed communions will be joined. Nor do I see any prospect that Catholicism and modern science will come to terms. Those principles of reason to which science is pledged will continue to be outraged so long as it is pretended that by the blessing of a priest oil receives holy properties, or that through baptism an infant mechanically escapes God's condemnation, or that the bones of the saints have spiritual value, or that disease is healed by visits to sacred shrines. I know that many medical certificates can be produced vouching for cures at Lourdes and elsewhere. Doubtless such were obtained in equal numbers by the guardians of pagan shrines five centuries before Christ taught in Galilee. Belief, though irrational, will at times cure functional disorders which are probably of mental origin. But it is untrue that a visit to, combined with prayer at, some shrine will lead to the instantaneous cure of such diseases as tuberculosis or locomotor ataxia. Were it true, rational medicine would be at an end.

I have mentioned, almost at random, typical beliefs or dogmas, still unrepudiated, which belong to unreformed Christianity. They are pagan accretions to the teaching of Christ. All such the man of science confidently rejects as irrational: he rightly deems them semi-magical beliefs, mere products of human misinterpretation. They offend him because they belong to a 'climate of opinion' in which science cannot flourish. He does not argue against them because he feels them unworthy of argument; but their existence is to him an unpleasant reminder that the bases of rational civilization are insecure. Because he believes in that civilization and because he, for the welfare of humanity, earnestly desires its progress, such superstitious beliefs create in his mind a bias against all religion, since a powerful Church can shelter these morbid growths. I feel forced to agree that against religion so corrupted science must for its own well-being wage war. But there need be no hostility between science and any religion that is truly moral and spiritual. The man of science with his passion for truth has normally a moral standard that merits respect: and there is no reason why his spiritual sensibility should be atrophied by the pursuit of natural knowledge. The assertion, too often made, that the pursuit of science leads to materialism is nonsense. Spinozistic monism or ethical theism are to-day the more common forms of belief towards which the man of science feels led.

I personally have a profound conviction that the ethical monotheism reached by the Hebrew prophets, and made central in the revelation of Christ, is true. No other type of monism accounts for that supremacy of the moral law which we are forced by some necessity of our nature to acknowledge. My fundamental conviction is, I believe, harmonious with the conclusions reached by modern scientific investigation and accords with the deepest and most valuable instincts to be found within us. The Reformers lacked our knowledge of nature; but, like all great religious leaders, they had a profound understanding of man's moral and spiritual capacities and possibilities. In sweeping away degenerate religious practices and beliefs they made faith alike more austere, more beautiful and more moral. Many religious enthusiasts four centuries ago were repelled by their teaching, just as many are repelled by ours to-day. There

will always be men and women who in religion resent the dry light of reason and find either in some relatively harmless picture-world or in some superstition the colour and romance which we all demand from life. Now it may safely be said that false beliefs practically always lead to defects of moral character. Of such defects intolerance is the most common. We cannot therefore condone superstition. But the somewhat austere faith which is ours, and for which we owe much to the Reformers, can be joined to active participation in the wholesome joys of life. It is not easy to preserve the balance truly between the unwholesome asceticism, which Luther so strongly condemned, and the immorality to which the pursuit of pleasure too easily leads. But our faith should be strong enough to preserve us from either extreme: it will have such strength if it is rightly centred on the teaching of Christ.

We can, in fact, appeal to Christ whenever the adequacy of our religious message is challenged. Because we feel that we must join the Christian faith to that knowledge of the created world which is given by modern science, we have of necessity to deny beliefs wrongly assumed to be part of the Christian message. There are, in consequence, many critics who find far too much that is negative in our teaching. When we claim to be heirs of the Reformation, they enquire why we have not, as had the Reformers, a positive message. Science, they urge, has a vast body of positive teaching which increases as the years pass; but Modernists, who profess to accept the discoveries of science and to weld them into the Christian faith, have an attenuated Gospel. In answer we confidently plead 'not guilty' to the charge. We can give stronger arguments than can any other religious movement for belief in God as Christ revealed Him. We affirm Christ's teaching as to man's duty and destiny and we see in Christ God reconciling the world to Himself. Concurrently with such teaching we assert that a 'reduced' religion is unfortunately a necessity when religion unreduced is swollen by untrue beliefs. We are living at a time when severe pruning of religious belief is necessary if there is to be healthy and vigorous growth. We can hope that, when we have done our work, young men and women will realize that those emotions which we call religious bring us to the very heart of things. We can also

hope that, as they consider the reason for, and nature of, their existence, they will be led to find a bridge across the gulf, deep and wide, between the knowledge won by science and the revelation of Christ. They will not make such a passage until they realize that the imponderables, beauty and goodness, which science to some extent neglects, are of primary importance in the realm of existence to which human personality belongs; and it is these supreme values which are harmed by religious error and superstition.

There remains the final question. Shall we always, in the well-known words, see 'as in a glass darkly'? Will man ever have as clear a knowledge of the realm of the spirit as he believes himself to have of the facts of daily life? Will he ever know the inner meaning and purpose of his creation, or of the universe in which he finds himself? Will God always be hidden?

I fancy that probably a large majority of thoughtful men and women privately believe that unclouded knowledge of God will be for ever withheld from creatures upon this earth and that we must be content with the speculative arguments of philosophers and the inspired guesses of religious seers. Personally I do not share such agnosticism. It is my personal faith that the Spirit of God will ultimately lead into all truth those creatures to whom He has given rational understanding. It is but a million years or so since the dawn of human rationality, when in some ape-like form man began to be. Measure the human race by its leaders, Newton, Darwin, Einstein, and you can but allow that we have travelled far along the road of knowledge and understanding. Yet apparently the sun's heat will permit animals like to ourselves to flourish upon the earth for another thousand million years at least. Is it necessary to assume that in such a vast time the closed door at which we now seem vainly to knock will not be opened? A progressive revelation of God's nature and purpose, of a range and character of which we cannot at present form any conception, seems to me to be a reasonable expectation. Such a revelation, moreover, will, I believe, result from that steady quest for truth which is the supreme purpose of science. And finally, if our faith is sound, and of that fact I have no doubt, the fullest revelation that may come will be found to be in harmony with the message of Christ.

THE PROTESTANT SCHOLASTICISM AND THE COUNTER-REFORMATION

By the Reverend Principal R. S. Franks, D.Litt.

THE subject assigned to me is the Protestant Scholasticism and the Counter-Reformation. In what respect can these two great historical phenomena be coupled together so as to compose one whole? As they stand, the two terms and the spheres which they represent do not exactly correspond. The Counter-Reformation stands for the whole retort of the Church of Rome to Protestantism. It includes its reply through discipline and life as well as its answer in the form of doctrine. But the Protestant Scholasticism stands for the reply of Protestantism to the Counter-Reformation in the sphere of doctrine only.

The Counter-Reformation includes the restoration of Catholic discipline as it took place in Spain. It comprises further the development of fresh movements in opposition to Protestantism, the centre of which is the Society of Jesus founded by the Spaniard, Ignatius Loyola. Finally, it involves the great doctrinal answer to the new teaching of the Reformers which is contained in the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent (1564) and in the defence of these Decrees by numerous Roman controversialists, above all the Jesuit Cardinal, Robert Bellarmine, in his famous work, 'Disputations on the Controversies of the Time' (1581).

It is to this last phase of the Counter-Reformation only that the Protestant Scholasticism girds itself up to return an adequate reply. While the Counter-Reformation stands for the complete answer of the Church of Rome to Protestantism, the Protestant Scholasticism stands for the reply of Protestantism to the Counter-Reformation only under certain limitations. It is the intellectual or doctrinal answer alone, not the whole answer. It is Protestantism's reply, not to the restored discipline or to the new life of the Roman Church, but only to the doctrinal counter-attack contained in the Decrees of Trent and in the work of its defenders.

Yet it was a right instinct that coupled the Protestant Scholasticism and the Counter-Reformation in spite of this disparity of the terms. For the special characteristic of historical Protestantism is the primacy of doctrine over all other expressions of Church life—rites, institutions, orders and so on. It is hardly too much to say with Troeltsch that Luther transformed Christianity into a pure transparency of thought and feeling (ein rein durchsichtiges Ereignis des Gedankens und der Gesinnung).[1] Within Protestantism, as in no other branch of Christianity, the rule obtained: 'As one thinketh in his heart, so is he.'[2] The problem of Protestantism from the first was to find the pure word of God, by which all institutions and all disciplines were to be tested. All manifestations of Christianity other than that of doctrine required to be doctrinally established and doctrinally justified. There was an end of the implicit faith which conformed to the Church's practice and left its interpretation to the theologians. Every Protestant was *ipso facto* a theologian: each was instructed in doctrine so as to use all rites and institutions with an explicit faith as to their meaning and value.

Hence, after all, the whole controversy of Protestantism with Rome is focussed in the battle as to doctrine. Here was the burning centre of dispute. An answer to Rome at this point was in a real sense an answer at all points. Consequently, in spite of what was said previously, we may now say, with a proper understanding of what is implied, that as the Counter-Reformation was the complete Roman reply to the Reformation, so the Counter-Reformation found its true answer in the Protestant Scholasticism.

I.

The immediate antithesis of the Protestant Scholasticism is, as has been indicated, the Decrees of Trent and the Roman defence of them. We shall do sufficient justice to the Counter-Reformation for our present purposes if we confine our attention to what is contained in these doctrinal statements. By the very

[1] *Die Kultur der Gegenwart.* Teil I, *Aufteilung IV*, 1, p. 458.

[2] *Proverbs* xxiii, v. 7.

necessity of the case the whole controversy of Rome with Protestantism is mirrored here, just as the whole controversy of Protestantism with Rome is summed up in the Protestant Scholasticism. The insistence of Protestantism on doctrine compelled the Roman Church to state everything that was vital to it in the form of doctrine, even though it had never been so stated before. Trent is essential Romanism in the form of doctrine, just as the Protestant Scholasticism is the essence of Protestantism in the same form.

It will suffice for present purposes to supplement the Decrees of Trent by Bellarmine's disputations only, without going further afield in the contemporary Roman polemic against Protestantism. Bellarmine is immeasurably the greatest of the Roman controversialists of the time; and he has stated the case of his Church with a fullness, a precision, a vividness and a force that are unequalled. It is no wonder that the Protestant schoolmen are perpetually answering Bellarmine, when they are not answering Trent itself.

The Council of Trent achieved both a consolidation and a development of Roman doctrine in answer to the Reformation. With the former aspect of its work we are not greatly concerned. Its controversial importance is simply that it drew the Catholic forces together against the common enemy.

Doctrine in the Middle Ages was contained in the great systems of the Schoolmen from Alexander of Hales to William of Ockham, of which we may distinguish four different types. These are:

(1) The early Franciscan school of Alexander and St. Bonaventura;

(2) The Dominican doctrine of Albert the Great and St. Thomas Aquinas;

(3) The later Franciscan doctrine of Duns Scotus; and

(4) The latest Franciscan theology of William of Ockham, usually called Nominalism.

The Council of Trent set itself to state accurately the doctrine of the Roman Church on the controversial points of original sin, justification, good works and the sacraments. On

all these points there were important school differences among the great medieval theologians. What Trent did was to compose a doctrine verbally dependent in the main upon St. Thomas, but with a statement so guarded as often to allow of an interpretation in the sense of Bonaventura or even of Scotus or Ockham.

The school differences within the Roman Church, however, after all only very slightly affect the front that it turns towards the Reformation. Though the medieval schools might differ among themselves, over against Protestantism they were essentially at one. It was affirmed by the Council of Trent in substantial agreement with all medieval theologians, that while humanity inherits Adam's guilt, the concupiscence or subordination of reason to sense which besets men as the result of the Fall, is not itself sin, as the Protestants said it was.

Justification is not forensic, nor is it based on faith alone, in the sense of *fiducia*, as the Reformers maintained. It is an actual making righteous; and true faith is such a belief in Christian truth as proceeds from grace infused into the soul, and is consequently informed by the supernatural principle of love. It is this supernatural principle that gives value to good works and makes them meritorious. The only proper ground of confidence is merit; but apart from special revelation no one can know that his merit is sufficient.

Grace is bestowed through the sacraments. The first grace is given in baptism; when it is lost by sin, it can be restored by the power of absolution in the sacrament of penance. The grace of this sacrament turns the mere natural and insufficient repentance of attrition into the supernatural and sufficient repentance of contrition. The medieval discipline of satisfaction is defended by the Fathers of Trent, as are also indulgences granted on the principle of the Church's superabundant treasury of merits, which can overflow to the benefit of the penitent.

All this, of course, is in sheer opposition to the doctrine of the Reformers. There is certainly some difference between Luther, Zwingli, Melancthon and Calvin in the consequence with which they carry out the principles of the Reformation. But all assert that grace is not a quality sacramentally infused into the soul: it is the free favour of God by which He justifies

men, *i.e.* accepts them as righteous entirely apart from works, merits or satisfactions, and solely on the ground of faith or confidence. Such faith is accompanied by repentance which issues in good works; but these must in no sense be brought into the question of justification. Satisfactions are valueless, and the Church has no power to grant indulgences: everything is given once for all in the free grace of God.

For Protestantism accordingly the sacraments come to have a different value from that assigned to them by Rome: they are essentially special forms of the gospel of grace. The tendency was to reduce their number to Baptism and the Lord's Supper only; though Luther still retained Absolution as in some sort a third sacrament.

Trent defended the seven medieval sacraments against the Protestants. It maintained the doctrine of Transubstantiation in opposition to all Protestant conceptions of the Lord's Supper. Above all, it asserted the special grace given in Ordination, which secured that the sacraments lawfully administered imparted grace to the recipient as a quality infused into the soul. On this point the whole Catholic system turned. Here was the real issue with Protestantism. At the Conference between Catholics and Protestants at Ratisbon, which preceded the Council of Trent, it had been found possible to come to a formal agreement at least about justification, but no agreement at all about the sacraments could be reached.

Schleiermacher was not far wrong, when he defined the difference between Catholicism and Protestantism by saying that the former relates the individual to Christ through the Church, while the latter relates him to the Church through Christ. The essence of Catholicism is the foundation of Christianity in the hierarchical institution which alone is the assured channel of grace through the sacraments. The essence of Protestantism is the basing of the Christian religion in the gospel which may be preached by cleric or layman equally.

The Protestant view of Christianity involves a revision of the notion of the Church, including the conception of orders. The Church is construed by Protestantism as the fellowship of believers, and the ministry as the instrument through which the Church normally exercises the office of preaching. In this office

there is included the administration of the sacraments, which act to seal the promises of the gospel upon the hearts of believers.

To Rome all such views were anathema. In opposition to all Protestant innovations the Council of Trent stated the general belief of the Catholic Church, as it had been held throughout Western Christendom in the Middle Ages. But the real problem of the Counter-Reformation on its doctrinal side was not the codification of medieval theology which was so triumphantly accomplished in the Tridentine Decrees. It was the proof of that doctrine in opposition to the attack of the Reformers.

Luther found the vulnerable point in the great medieval theological system, when he disputed its derivation from Holy Scripture. The medieval schoolmen always put forward their doctrine as the doctrine of Holy Scripture. Here Alexander, Bonaventura, Thomas, Duns and Ockham are all agreed. There are indeed differences. The early Franciscans emphasize the mystical interpretation of Scripture as the proper basis of theology. Aquinas, while not refusing the assistance of allegorical interpretation, demands that all theology be sufficiently founded upon the literal sense of Scripture. Moreover, he says distinctly that the authority of the Fathers or of the Doctors of the Church is always subordinate to that of Scripture. It was only the later theologians, Duns Scotus and Gabriel Biel the Occamist, who first saw the difficulty of proving everything from Scripture, and who accordingly began to assert the necessity of supplementing Scripture by tradition.

We see that in this question Luther and the other Reformers followed St. Thomas. Trent on the other hand, recognizing the impossibility of meeting the Reformation on the ground of Scripture alone, followed the suggestions of Scotus and Biel, only that it still further defined the force and value of ecclesiastical tradition as the necessary supplement of Scripture. This was to admit that the Thomist system could not be proved from its own presuppositions, but could only be established by a widening of them in the direction of the later Scholasticism.

The salient point in the controversy between Rome and Protestantism thus becomes the question of the adequacy of the

Scriptures for the proof of Christian doctrine. The position of the Tridentine Council is carefully defined as follows :[3]

(1) The purpose of the Council is to preserve the purity of the Gospel, which was first proclaimed by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and afterwards was preached in accordance with His commandment to all men by the Apostles as the source both of saving truth and moral discipline.

(2) The Council perceives that this truth and discipline is contained both in Scripture and in the unwritten traditions which are derived from Christ through the Apostles, or from the Apostles as they were inspired by the Holy Spirit, and which have come down to the present time.

(3) Accordingly, following the example of the orthodox Fathers, the Council accepts with equal reverence both Scripture and tradition.

Such were the main principles on the authority of Scripture and tradition laid down at Trent. The retention in agreement with tradition of the Apocrypha and of the Vulgate version as authoritative Scripture are after all only minor points: the issue of all is that whoever contemns tradition is to be anathema.

In this settlement as to the interpretation of Scripture Trent carefully left one point undefined. Who, making application of tradition to the interpretation of Scripture, was to decide the true meaning? The Council was not resolved as to whether the decision should be that of an Oecumenical Council, or of the Pope, or of both together.

It is here that Bellarmine in his 'Disputations' comes in to supplement Trent with a decision in favour of the Pope. He distinguishes four possible opinions on the matter, and gives his judgment as to their validity.[4]

First opinion. The Pope even with the assistance of a general council is fallible. This view is stark heresy.

Second opinion. The Pope apart from a general council is fallible. This view is barely tenable.

Third opinion. The Pope alone is always infallible. This view is probable.

[3] *Sessio quarta.*

[4] *De Romano Pontifice,* lib. IV, c.2.

Fourth opinion. The Pope alone is infallible, when he speaks *ex cathedra.* This last view is absolutely certain.

To sum up: Bellarmine supplements the Council of Trent by saying definitely who is to be judge in doctrinal controversies. It is to be the Pope. Bellarmine argues against the Protestants that their appeal to the Scriptures amounts to making each private person a judge, with the result that the judges differ among themselves. The Reformers brought in the testimony of the Holy Ghost as the power which enables the Christian, not only to believe the Scriptures true, but also to understand their meaning. But this, says Bellarmine, is no help in case of difference of opinion. If the Protestants are right, the Holy Ghost taught Luther one thing and Zwingli another. Unless there is some one judge, there can be no certainty of faith anywhere.

Bellarmine further argued that Scripture was not absolutely necessary to the existence of the Church. Before there was a New Testament, the Church was sustained by oral tradition. Moreover, it was the Church that fixed the canon of Scripture, and it did so upon the basis of tradition. Scripture therefore itself comes within the ambit of tradition. It represents a particular case, where Apostolic tradition has been put into writing; while after all the only guarantee that this writing is Apostolic is other tradition accepted as Apostolic by the Church.

Finally, Bellarmine pointed out that the origin of doctrinal controversy could be traced back to the disagreement of one Scripture with another. Scripture itself was of such a nature as to demand an infallible interpreter; and who could this be but the Pope, the successor of Peter, to whom Christ Himself had given the primacy in His Church, and who for so many centuries had been the acknowledged head of Christendom?

It was not merely the individual arguments of Bellarmine that created difficulty for Protestant controversialists. These particular arguments gained in power because they were sustained by a system and a method. The system was the great medieval construction due to St. Thomas, and the method was that of Scholasticism in general.

Aquinas certainly built upon the previous work of Peter Lombard and still more on that of Alexander of Hales; and his system was refined upon by Duns Scotus and Ockham in various

particulars. But the strength of system which gave power to the Roman Church came from St. Thomas himself more than from any other medieval schoolman. It was a neo-Thomism that shaped the decisions of Trent: and it is a neo-Thomism that gives strength to Bellarmine's disputations, by making every point contribute successfully to the total effect.

This effect was further enhanced by Bellarmine's employment, not only of the Thomist system, but also of the Thomist and general scholastic method of dividing the material into questions with arguments for and against the solution ultimately accepted. Very little could escape the fine-drawn net of this analysis: it furnished a most powerful engine of attack and defence against the Protestants, the effect of which they were not slow to feel.

II.

It was this situation which compelled Protestantism to develop a new scholasticism of its own, which could meet the Roman controversialists on equal terms.

The original statements of Reformation doctrine were simply positive. Luther and Melancthon, Zwingli and Calvin all alike abjured scholasticism and the scholastic method. The classical style and manner revived by the Renaissance increasingly dominated Protestant theology: it is especially characteristic of such works as Melancthon's *Loci Theologici* and Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Argument of course there was: there is plenty of it, especially in the *Institutes*. But the scholastic method has been abandoned.

What, again, is to be said about system? There is in the early Protestant theology an advance in this direction which culminates in the final edition of the *Institutes* in 1556. The systematic character of Calvin's work has often been dwelt upon and often praised. But we have to remember that in the process of history the *Institutes*, not to speak of the other older theology of the Reformation, had to be supplemented by the Protestant Scholasticism and interpreted through it.

If we compare even the final edition of the *Institutes* with the system of St. Thomas we soon perceive the difference. The *Institutes* contain a Biblical theology with a minimum of philo-

sophical cement. The *Summa* of St. Thomas is a genuinely philosophical theology in which the rights of reason are fully recognized.

Protestant theology at this stage was at a disadvantage, when confronted by a controversialist who could make use of the Thomist system and method to deal with the new questions raised by the Reformation. Something more was necessary than had been attempted in the sixteenth century for the defence of the Reformation; and so the seventeenth century brought forth the Protestant Scholasticism, which borrowed the adversary's weapons and turned them against himself. We recognize an advance towards the scholastic standpoint in the great *Examination of the Decrees of the Council of Trent* by Martin Chemnitz (1578), and still more in the *Loci Theologici* of John Gerhard (1610). But scholasticism full blown, with a complete philosophical system and a fully analytic method, only came with the advance of the seventeenth century in the work of men like the Lutheran John Andreas Quenstedt, whose *Theologia didactico-polemica* was published in 1685, and the Calvinist Francis Turretin, whose *Institutio Theologiae Elencticae* appeared in 1674.

I shall use the latter work for the purposes of our comparative study. Here we have a setting-out of the position of the Reformation as fully philosophical in substance and as thoroughly analytical in method as the system of St. Thomas. As a matter of fact, the general philosophical basis is simply borrowed from Aquinas. One may read precisely the same Thomist natural theology in Bellarmine's Disputations and in the *Theologia elenctica* of Turretin.

Bellarmine writes that in the Church of necessity many things beyond human reason must be believed, and many things beyond human strength must be done.[5] Turretin says:

> 'Although natural revelation gives us various truths concerning God, His attributes, His will and His works; yet apart from supernatural revelation it does not teach us what can suffice for a saving knowledge of God.'[6]

In a word, both the Roman controversialist and the Protestant scholastic presuppose the whole framework of Thomism,

[5] *De Verbo Dei, I,* ii.
[6] Loc ii, qu 1. vi.

with its basis of a natural or rational theology and its superstructure of a supernatural or revealed theology which alone can elevate man to a communion with God.

Within this Thomist framework it is the chief concern of the Protestant schoolmen to maintain the authority, the necessity, the perfection and the perspicuity of Scripture as the one fountain of revealed truth. Turretin teaches as follows:

(1) Scripture is necessary, inasmuch as there is no exactitude except in what was written down while the Apostles lived. While the Apostles were alive, oral tradition was all very well; but since their days no oral tradition can compete with Scripture.

(2) The authority of Scripture depends on the witness of the Holy Ghost to its truth. But this does not mean that the Spirit gives us truth objectively: for that we have to go to the Scripture itself. The Spirit simply teaches us subjectively to recognize Scripture as of Divine authority.

(3) The perfection of Scripture means that it requires no supplementation from tradition. The witness of the Spirit makes the believer independent in principle of any testimony from the Church, however valuable such testimony may be as an additional confirmation of what he knows already.

(4) Finally, the perspicuity of Scripture means that it requires no interpreter beyond itself. There are and can be no real contradictions in Scripture. What is obscure in one place is clear in another.

We learn from the example of Turretin what was the reply which the Protestant Scholasticism gave to Trent on the all-important point of Holy Scripture. It then proceeded on the basis of Scripture, as thus assured, to carry out its theological system into completest detail. The doctrines of God, the Trinity and the Incarnation, correspond in general to those of the mediæval scholasticism; but on the contrary the Protestant doctrines of original sin, of justification and sanctification, of good works, and of the Church and the Sacraments were defended from Scripture. The seventeenth-century schoolmen were not innovators in these doctrines: they simply employed the scholastic method to develop and defend the doctrines of the original Reformers. Having disposed of the appeal to tradi-

tion, they were able to do this with comparative ease. Whatever modern scholarship may have taught us as to the subtle differences between Protestantism and Paulinism, there can be no doubt that Protestantism had right on its side in appealing to Paul against the Roman Church. Luther's *Commentary on Galatians* and Melancthon's *Loci Theologici*, based on the Epistle to the Romans, show how the early Reformers were inspired by Pauline thought. The Protestant schoolmen found in Paul sufficient 'clear' passages to set against any 'obscurities' to be found in other parts of Scripture or in Paul himself.

In only one other doctrine besides the doctrine of Holy Scripture was the Protestant scholasticism genuinely creative. This was the doctrine of the Atonement, where on the basis of beginnings in the original theology of the Reformation the seventeenth-century doctors developed in a very thorough-going way what has since been called the orthodox theology of the subject. This well-known doctrine is that of Christ's three offices, prophetic, priestly and kingly. The centre of the whole was in the priestly office, whereby Christ made satisfaction for our sins and merited salvation for us. He accomplished both these tasks by His obedience to the law, in actively fulfilling its precepts and passively enduring its penalties. The whole doctrine was a great theory, greatly conceived: it is only just to recognize this, however far we may have moved from it since.

The scholasticism of the seventeenth century served Protestantism well. It certainly left one weak place in the defence against Rome. All that Turretin can say in answer to Bellarmine's taunt that the Holy Spirit taught Luther and Zwingli different things, is the dogmatic statement that whoever deviates from the view which he himself represents, *viz.* that of the Reformed Church, shows himself *ipso facto* not to be taught of the Spirit. The Pope himself could not be more absolute.

But, in the main, the new scholasticism enabled the Protestant Churches to carry on their controversy with Rome successfully. It afforded them at the same time a large and comprehensive system in which they moved freely, feeling that their Gospel reposed upon a complete and sufficient philosophy.

III.

To-day the Protestant scholasticism hardly survives as more than a historical memory. It is a very few that are led to turn over the pages of the great folios and thick quartos in which the mighty dead of seventeenth-century Protestantism fought their battles and won their triumphs. What victory they won seems to have been a Pyrrhic victory.

What were the causes of the downfall of the Protestant scholasticism, and of its disappearance as a living influence? An answer to this question may be returned under three heads: (1) the new stress on religious experience; (2) the development of historical criticism; and (3) the decline of the traditional natural theology.

(1) The extreme intellectualism of the Protestant Scholasticism led to the Pietistic reaction, which ultimately brought about that resolution of doctrine back into experience, which is especially associated with the name of Schleiermacher.

(2) Historical criticism upset the doctrine of the perfection and perspicuity of Holy Scripture. It was here that the Counter-Reformation really scored a point against the Protestant Scholasticism. In the end it was impossible to maintain that there were no contradictions in Scripture. The investigations of these contradictions issued in historical criticism, with its reduction of the one absolute authority of all Scripture to a relativity of authority in its different parts. It is interesting to note that the modern method of interpreting the Scriptures through the special circumstances of their origin is already anticipated by Bellarmine, when he emphasizes the fact that the Evangelists and the Apostles all wrote by way of occasion; and never with a definitely systematic purpose, in which case he says they would have written a catechism or some such book.[7]

(3) Finally, the rational theology, which was the support alike of Roman and Protestant scholasticism, gave way before the criticism of Hume and Kant.

Thus no part of the great structure raised by the Protestant schoolmen was left secure, but all alike came crashing down in ruin. To-day our problems are other than those of the seven-

[7] *De verbo Dei IV*, 4.

teenth century doctors of Protestantism, and our methods must inevitably be other than theirs. In their controversy with Rome they earned well-merited laurels, even if they were not completely successful; but in the modern settlement with historical criticism and science they can offer no guidance.

It might indeed be thought that under these new circumstances Rome has the advantage over Protestantism, inasmuch as a Roman theologian like Bellarmine could admit contradictions in the Bible, whereas it was fatal to the old Protestant position to recognize them. But the advantage is only apparent. Historical criticism cannot be limited to the Bible: it attacks equally the dogmas of the Church. The Roman infallibility of the Pope can no more stand with it than can the Protestant infallibility of the Bible; while modern science is incompatible with orthodox Protestantism and Romanism alike.

The only form in which Christianity can continue to exist in the modern world is some form of Modernism, which construes it, not as a religion of authority, but as a religion of the Spirit. Roman Modernism is by Rome's own judgment a contradiction in terms. But a Protestant Modernism is possible, as a Liberal Evangelicalism in which faith in God (*fiducia*) is disentangled from the acceptance of the infallibility of the Bible. Even such a position is difficult to maintain; but it is not for Christianity to be afraid of difficulties.

LATER PROTESTANT MOVEMENTS IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND SINCE THE REFORMATION

By the Rev. Professor Norman Sykes, D.Phil.

OF the Ecclesia Anglicana as refashioned by the Reformation, as of the matriarch of Israel, it may be truly said that two nations were within its womb and two peoples should be separated from its bowels. For whatever traces may be discerned in the pre-Reformation period of a nascent Puritan tradition within the Catholic Church, it was the cataclysm of the Reformation movement which brought it to the birth in England. In most countries which severed their connection with Rome and adopted the Reformed version of Christianity this tradition became the sole ecclesiastical profession. But in England, though domesticated securely within the communion of the National Church, it lay as an uncomfortable bed-fellow side by side with a complementary tradition which, in appearance contradictory, laboured to emphasize the continuity of the Reformed Church with the pre-Reformation Society in all essential matters of faith and polity. The juxtaposition of the Anglican and Puritan traditions within the framework of the English Church was the result of the peculiar character of the Tudor Reformation. The statesmen who essayed the bold endeavour of the Elizabethan Settlement to tread the *via media* between Rome and Geneva, desired to comprehend as many as possible of the supporters both of Catholic doctrine and of Protestant principles, and to create a Church which should be in truth the Church of the English by allowing a wide latitude of interpretation of formularies of faith and rubrics of practical order. It is essential to remark that the settlement was the work of Parliament, not of Convocation; of the laity, not of the hierarchy; and of the *politiques*, not of the religious zealots. From this circumstance ensued the peculiar characteristic that the subsequent history of the English Church has been the record largely of a continuous

contest between the parties of Anglican and Puritan, and of an alternating series of religious movements provoked in turn by reaction against the dominion of one or another school and in turn yielding pre-eminence to its resuscitated rival. But whilst Anglican and Puritan have maintained a saecular contention for pre-eminence, the State has continued faithful to the designs of the Elizabethan Settlement by affording protection and restraint to each successive ecclesiastical movement. The vesting of the supremacy over all causes and persons ecclesiastical in the hand of a civil governor, whether the Sovereign personally or the Crown in Parliament, has ensured the protection of unpopular religious minorities against the danger of episcopal and clerical persecution, and the restraint of their leaders when, having attained to command of the agents of ecclesiastical authority, they desired to inflict like suppression upon their destined supplanters. Whether for good or ill, the Reformed Church has been required to govern its policy and moderate its zeal in accordance with the fidelity of the civil government to its resolve to set to ecclesiastical parties the bounds which they shall not pass and to preserve the comprehensive character of the National Church.

It is the province of this paper to essay an interpretation of the history of the Protestant tradition since the Reformation, and especially during the period from the Restoration of 1660 to the rise of the Oxford Movement. To interpret the principles underlying its various manifestations necessitates some preliminary survey of its origin in the Puritan movement of the reign of Elizabeth. It was inevitable that this tradition should try conclusions with its rival immediately the constitutional framework of the Establishment had been settled in 1559. To the zealous divines who had avoided martyrdom and sought consolation by forsaking the England of Mary Tudor for the Geneva of Calvin, the accession of Elizabeth seemed a providential invitation to reproduce in their fatherland the theocracy of the French reformer as they had seen it in the city of his adoption. Their enthusiasm for the politic compromise of the Elizabethan Settlement was tepid, since to zealots for a root and branch reformation its retention of the old episcopal administration, and even of the second Edwardine Prayer Book

in substance, seemed but a short step from the Popish abomination. Upon the most favourable view it was a tolerable half-way house and a temporary shelter, capable of ministering the grace whereby men could be saved, but standing in need of thoroughgoing reconstruction so soon as the political hostility of France and Spain and the danger of a Catholic crusade to restore England to the Papal obedience should be overpast. The Puritan conformist of the Elizabethan Church professed allegiance to it, as did the Vicar of Bray to the Protestant succession, with the compromising reservation 'until the times do alter.' But the interval destined to elapse before the alteration of the times permitted the completion of the Reformation by the extirpation of all relics of Popery from the Liturgy and Constitution of the Church, proved too long for the patience of urgent spirits. Accordingly, by the end of Elizabeth's reign the Puritan party had split into two sections, the conformists and the formal separatists.

It is important to realise the strength of the Puritan tradition within the Establishment. Only a minority of Puritans were definitely separatist; the majority conformed, having secured meantime wide concessions in regard to ceremonial, and awaiting the suitable occasion to press for further reforms. The recent study of Canon Foster of *The State of the Church in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I as illustrated by documents relating to the Diocese of Lincoln* has emphasized the influence and strength of the Puritan element in the largest diocese of post-Reformation England; and Canon Watson has observed of the Puritan clergy in general that 'in the latter years of Elizabeth they abandoned their hopes of reconstructing the Church and acquiesced in conformity'; of which abundant proof was forthcoming when to the Westminster Assembly of 1643, 'from every county of England came grave, elderly, learned men, episcopally ordained under Elizabeth or James, beneficed clergy who had conformed for years to the Prayer Book and worn their surplice.' The Commonwealth experiment in religion proved almost as unpalatable to these moderate conformist Puritans as to the Laudian school of Arminian high church divines; and in consequence many of the leaders of the Presbyterian party hailed the restoration of the Stuart dynasty in 1660 with similar expectation to that cherished by their predecessors upon its in-

auguration in 1603, as the occasion for cementing the unity of Anglican and Puritan, and of Episcopalian and Presbyterian, against the pretensions and extravagances of the sects.

The failure of the Savoy Conference in 1661 marked a turning-point in the history of the Protestant tradition in England. Hitherto the possibility had been present of the legal enactment of such a further project of reform of the doctrine and discipline of the Established Church as would comprehend the great majority of the Presbyterian party within its full communion, and enable it to justify its claim to be the National Church against the numerically insignificant sectaries, both Independent and Popish. The victory of the Anglican party in the Restoration settlement marked the end of such hopes, and although for a generation the possibility lingered of a reversal of this verdict, the final defeat of the project of a Comprehension was enacted in 1689 by the Revolution settlement and the Toleration Act. Contemporaneously with these events there arose a new theological movement within the Church which swept away the bases alike of the old Anglican and Puritan traditions; but before attempting to assess the significance of the Latitudinarian revival it may be profitable to survey briefly the characteristic features of the seventeenth century Puritan position.

In the realm of public worship the victory of the Protestant tradition appeared almost complete. The 82nd Canon of the Canons of 1604 had prescribed rules of great moderation in relation to the Holy Communion. For that rite there should be provided a 'convenient and decent table,' which at the time of the celebration of the Sacrament should be placed 'in so good sort within the church or chancel as thereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants in his prayer and ministration, and the communicants also more conveniently and in more number may communicate with the said minister.' Except in cathedral and collegiate churches, where the use of a 'decent cope' was prescribed, the surplice was the recognized vestment for the Communion. The English parish church, with its adornment of the Sanctuary by the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed and divers texts of Holy Scripture, surmounted by the Royal Arms, and with its quarterly

Sacrament, suggested a religious tradition more in accord with Puritan notions than with those of the pre-Reformation era. In *The Blecheley Diary* of William Cole, an antiquary and high churchman of the Georgian age, there is an interesting entry of the year 1767 relating to the Christmas Communion: 'I ordered the Table to be set under the middle East window, it being before in the middle of the church.' Apart therefore from the few nocent ceremonies still observed, such as the kneeling position at the reception of the Communion, the sign of the Cross in baptism and the ring in marriage, the Puritan might be well contented with the extent of the victory of his principles in the public worship of the Church. Nor was his conscience disturbed by the problem of episcopacy. The Presbyterian leaders in 1660 professed no hostility either to the maintenance of episcopacy or to the principle of a public liturgy. Their desires were for a constitutional episcopate, fashioned according to the compromise associated with the name of Ussher, and following the precedent set by the creation of a Scottish episcopate in 1610 by the consecration of divines in Presbyterian orders to an office which amounted to little more than that of permanent presidents of ecclesiastical synods. Theologically, the Puritan tradition inherited the staunch Calvinism professed by Whitgift, which had continued to characterize the preaching and belief of the Protestant party.

Over against the Puritan attitude towards the conduct of public worship, the problem of ecclesiastical polity, and the Calvinistic theology, the Laudian high church school had arisen to maintain a contrary position. In regard to the divine service of the Church it had aimed only at moderate changes, such as the restoration of the Holy Table to the East end of the church and the erection of a rail to fence it off from profanation. In relation to episcopacy the Caroline divines had adopted a stronger position. Attracted towards the Eastern Orthodox Church by the interest aroused in that venerable communion through the studies and geographical contact of British chaplains to the Levant, and eager to assert the continuity of the English Church before and after its Reformation, they laid great stress upon the witness of episcopacy to that continuity and upon its essentiality to a true branch of the Catholic Church.

In theology, likewise, the Caroline school was of the persuasion of Arminius in the dark mysteries of doctrine in which he parted from Calvin, and warm disputes were essayed upon the questions of predestination, election and free will. But in one respect Puritan and Anglican, Calvinist and Arminian were at one, namely, in their assumption of the infallibility and inerrancy of Holy Writ. The Puritan indeed accepted the Bible as the sole basis of Christian doctrine, whilst the Anglican added as an interpretative rule the traditions of the Undivided Church and its General Councils; but both parties alike rested their argument upon the uncritical use of scriptural texts which was the natural outcome of a belief in the verbal inerrancy of the Bible.

In this regard they were equally discomfited by the rise of the new theological tradition of the Latitudinarian movement and unable to sustain their positions against its onslaught. For the new spirit of critical enquiry which is thus denominated cared for none of the theological disputations of Calvinist and Arminian. It rejected alike the Holy Scriptures and ecclesiastical tradition as the authority for religious belief and proposed to subject both to destructive criticism. The eighteenth century brought to birth the scientific and rationalist movement in relation to theology and religion. For this cause it has been accorded by general consent a position of unenviable distinction as the Age of Reason, or of Unbelief. Not even its greatest champions could designate it an age of Faith. But before affirming that its principles were exclusively destructive and infidel, it may be worth while to examine the causes and characteristics of so widespread and influential a mode of thought.

Of the international scope of its influence no question may be entertained. Nor did its subtle atmosphere fail to penetrate even the rigid antiquarianism of Rome. Alexander Pope was no Deist, but a Papist in an age when that religious profession closed the door to office and honour in England. Yet few poets have caught more clearly the accents of the anti-dogmatic rationalist movement of his age. Assuredly Hobbes, rather than a defender of revealed religion, should have exhorted his fellows to such an anthropocentric view of life as :

> Know thyself : presume not God to scan :
> The proper study of Mankind is Man.

The professed Romanist must have shed indeed the greater portion of the faith of his Church, with a double measure of its persecuting spirit, before he likewise wrote :

> For modes of Faith let graceless zealots fight :
> He can't be wrong whose life is in the right.
> In Faith and Hope the world will disagree,
> But all mankind's concern is charity :
> All must be false that thwart this one great end ;
> And all of God, that bless mankind, or mend.

Nor, when Pope essayed to counteract the charge that his *Essay on Man* contained dangerous tendencies towards Naturalism and Fatalism, by the composition of *The Universal Prayer*, could his exposition of the doctrine of God be granted the imprimatur of Catholic orthodoxy. From the outset of its address to the Deity as

> 'Father of All, in every age
> In every clime adored,
> By saint, by savage and by sage,
> Jehovah, Jove or Lord,'

the prayer followed contemporary fashion in referring to Him as 'The Great First Cause,' in depreciating the presumptuous vanity of mortals—

> 'Let not this weak, unknowing hand
> Presume Thy bolts to throw,
> And deal damnation round the land,
> On each I judge Thy foe'—

and in terminating upon the same note of strait Monotheism :

> 'To Thee whose temple is all space,
> Whose altar, earth, sea, skies,
> One chorus let all Being raise,
> All Nature's incense rise.'

Verily, though the pen was that of a Papist, the sentiments were those of Deism.

Whence then sprang the Deist movement which had insinuated its tenets into the poetry of Pope? Its provenance must be sought, not in a single cause, but in the cumulative effect of a variety of influences. Reaction against the intense theological rivalries and sectarian disputations of the previous century was an obvious and immediate factor. Not unnaturally were the seventeenth century wars of religion, waged in theological tomes no less than upon the devastated territories of German princelings, followed by a generation impatient of such scholastic

quibbles and debauched by a surfeit of cakes and ale. But of greater and more profound importance was the rise of the new scientific movement. The little company of savants who from the tower of Wadham College, Oxford, inaugurated the campaign of Natural Science to banish ignorance and mythology were symbolical of the spirit of the new age. Raised above the clamours of the vulgar populace, they sought proof of the existence and attributes of the Deity from the study of His work in the created universe. The period of the invention and popularization of the telescope and microscope, of the thermometer and barometer, was one of great scientific investigation; and in particular men were led, according to a reviving fashion, to interpret the Creator in terms of astronomy. The realization of the infinity and of the unvarying regularity of the visible universe implanted a serious conception of the majesty and power of the Deity. The Creator was evidently a God of Order and Law. The effect of this reassuring discovery upon the minds of men and upon their theological beliefs can hardly be overestimated. The sense of relief evoked by the conviction that the God with whom they had commerce both in the world of Nature and within the individual soul was a God of Trust, not of Caprice, found expression in the vogue of the doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood. Further, the Father of All was beneficent; His contrivance of Nature to minister to the convenience of mankind was a proof demonstrative of His favour to man; for though the centrality of the earth in the universe had been disproved, no doubt existed of the supreme status of man as the sole object of the Creator's paternal government. The combination of this scientific interest with the strongly anthropocentric tendency of the age led to the proclamation as the two cardinal truths of religion of the Fatherhood of God and the duty of beneficence in man.

Under such inspiration the Latitudinarian movement became the natural parent of a new scheme of theology and morality, into which indeed the traditional tenets of revealed religion intruded with not inconsiderable disharmony. For if the nature of the Creator were deducible from the study of creation, wherein lay the occasion for a specific revelation to one particular nation in the history of the world? The witness of the moral

law within the conscience of man was as direct and universal as that of the visible universe without. What need was there for an indirect and particularist revelation through the Jewish people? Upon closer scrutiny, also, the credentials of this pretended revelation appeared of exceedingly doubtful authenticity. Written in languages no longer current and understanded of the people, preserved in a series of books of uncertain authorship, and in some respects self-contradictory, buttressed by miraculous events and prophetic predictions, and embracing alleged divine commands to actions of immorality and cruelty, the Biblical record in its claim to infallibility and inerrancy was canvassed and challenged with unprecedented urgency. The eighteenth century was characterized by an intense study of the Old and New Testament Scriptures; by Deists who allegorized the stories of miracle, rejected the predictive character of prophetic utterance, denounced the moral imperfections of the Hebrews, and pointed out historical inconsistencies in the sacred narratives; and by orthodox divines who defended the integrity and honesty of the Evangelists and compiled an Old Bailey theology in support of the authenticity of apostolic narratives of the Resurrection. Even Dean Swift, a Tory high churchman, testified to the influence of Latitudinarian theology in his definition of a Church of England man as one who 'believed a God and His providence, together with revealed religion and the divinity of Christ,' a succinct creed which avoided the elaboration of detailed dogmas. It is impossible to censure either Deist or orthodox for their failure to understand the notion of a progressive revelation and to apply the (as yet unfamiliar) concept of evolution to the history of religion. But lacking this key to the solution of their difficulties, the champions of natural religion could do little save pose questions to which their opponents had no sufficient answer, since their contention for the authority of Scripture applied equally to every line and portion thereof.

Nor could appeal be made in this Biblical dispute to any agreed standard of interpretation, such as is furnished by the principles of modern literary and historical criticism of the Bible. Orthodox divines might fall back upon ecclesiastical tradition, or might rest their defence simply upon the literal exegesis of Scripture; but the Deists made appeal to a new court of judg-

ment, that of Reason. They insisted that if the doctrines of Christianity were contrary to the conclusions of human reason, they were erroneous and inacceptable; and the result of this argument was the establishment of Reason as the arbiter in matters *de fide*. Even defenders of revelation laboured to demonstrate that it was founded upon reason and not contradictory to it, though transcending the unaided operation of the human mind. It is easy to criticise the insufficiency of the Deist appeal to the common reason of ordinary humanity, though this insistence was germane to its advocacy of natural religion and its robust confidence in the innate capacity of mankind for discerning between right and wrong, truth and falsehood. But notwithstanding the error of making vulgar ignorance the test of truth, the widespread acceptance of the principle that Scripture must be interpreted according to rationalistic canons was a remarkable feature of the age of Reason. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that the construction of the modern scientific apologetic for Christianity dates from the Deist movement of the eighteenth century, which Dr. Tennant has just denominated 'the beginning of modernity in English theology.'

The influence of the *zeitgeist* upon the domestic fortunes of the Protestant tradition in England was far-reaching. The conduct of public worship, indeed, had been sufficiently Protestantized already as to leave little room for reform. The Georgian parish church retained little of ornament or ceremonial to suggest the mysterious and supernatural; and such elements as clung still to the office of the Eucharist were attacked in such tracts as Bishop Hoadly's *Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*. Naturally the sermon was the most faithful reflex of dominant fashions. *The Journal of a Somerset Rector* depicts John Skinner at Camerton, a latitudinarian surviving out of due time into the tumultuous days of the first Reform Act, delivering to his rustic and industrial congregation a series of apologetic discourses upon the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed and the evidences of Christianity, and labouring zealously 'to show what was the meaning of the Sacred Writings and to do so in a rational manner.' Similarly, the sermons of Anthony Hartwell, incumbent of Kildale and Great Ayton in the North Riding of Yorkshire, in the mid-

eighteenth century, are described by Canon Watson as typical of many contemporary exhortations, 'without height or depth,' in which the preacher 'dwells on the mercy of a God who will not demand an unreasonable standard of goodness from His creatures. Let them be kind and honest, let them be sober on market days, then they will certainly go to heaven and probably will reap a good harvest.' Such a theological outlook made short work of confessional and ecclesiastical differences which parted church from church. Christians sharing a common belief in the Fatherhood of God and the duty of human beneficence were impatient of the barriers of Church Order, whether episcopal or presbyterian, and of the subscription to theological creeds which severed them in public prayer and sacrament from each other. Hence the entire problem of episcopacy, which had been so important with the Caroline divines, was relegated to the ecclesiastical lumber-room by prelates of the levelling tendencies of Hoadly. That bishop earned an unenviable notoriety by pushing to its logical conclusion the Latitudinarian indifference to forms of Church government in his famous sermon, *The Nature of the Kingdom and Church of Christ*, from which the Christian ecclesia emerged as little more than an invisible society, or at most a voluntary association of persons united by the sole bond of sincerity of belief. Indeed, the new Protestant tradition, in its zeal for simplicity of theological doctrine, produced the famous Feathers' Tavern Petition, presented to Parliament in 1772 for the relief of the Anglican clergy from the burden of subscription to the Articles of Belief, and rejected in the House of Commons by the eloquence of Burke. On the positive side, however, it should be remembered that the Latitudinarian movement was fruitful in good works, especially in encouraging that motive of benevolence from which sprang the numerous eighteenth century hospital foundations, alike in the university towns and in the counties at large. Such a philanthropic and therapeutic work remains the abiding glory of the theology of Divine beneficence which gave it birth.

It would have been well if the revived Protestant tradition had not coincided with the *quieta non movere* statecraft of Hanoverian England, which surrounded it by an insidious atmosphere of apathy. Otherwise its principles might have

found abundant expression by anticipating the later extensions of humanitarian zeal which proceeded from the renewed inspiration of the Evangelical revival. The Methodist movements, led by John Wesley and George Whitefield, were a natural, even necessary, reaction against the shortcomings of a tradition slipping by reason of its dominance into decline. Belief in the Fatherhood of God was not the entire evangel of Christianity, and some impetus was needed to prevent its degeneracy into easy good-nature and to impart its spirit to the uneducated and vicious lower classes. Further, an influential tendency was operating to convert the Fatherhood of God into a Deistic Unitarianism, built upon the scientific cult of the infinite Author of the universe and upon the rationalistic study of Scripture which, failing to discover the Catholic Trinitarian doctrine in the pages of the New Testament, concluded that Arianism was primitive Christology and therefore the true theological belief. The Trinitarian controversy affected the Established Church considerably, finding in Dr. Samuel Clarke a learned and able exponent of the case against Athanasius, whilst upon the Presbyterian and other Dissenting bodies it fell with the destructive force of a tornado. It was against this peril of a widespread descent into Unitarianism, to which the Latitudinarian orthodoxy offered an ineffective barrier, that the Evangelical revival erected new bulwarks in the shape of a renewed personal religion and piety built upon the old theological scholasticism. The Correspondence of John Wesley contains, indeed, interesting evidence of his theological starting point, when in a letter of July, 1725, to his mother he defined faith as 'an assent to any truth upon rational grounds'; since 'faith is a species of belief and belief is defined as "an assent to a proposition upon rational grounds"; without rational grounds, therefore, there is no belief and consequently no faith.' The most remarkable feature of his development was the rapidity with which he shed this fashionable rationalism, for by the following November he was fully persuaded 'that saving faith is an assent to what God has revealed because He has revealed it and not because the truth of it may be evinced by reason.' From this standpoint he never swerved, and the Methodist revival had broken decisively with the current theology of the age.

Between Wesley and Whitefield the difference lay in the Arminianism of the former and the stern Calvinism of the latter, rather than in any lingering sympathy of Wesley with contemporary Latitudinarianism. Both preachers insisted upon the necessity of sudden conversion and of an assurance of salvation wholly alien to the ideas of Divine Paternal Beneficence and the duty of a reasonable service on the part of man. The Methodist converts were in no danger of entertaining Arian views of the Christ, in whose sacrifice upon the Cross lay their only hope of redemption from the corruption and sinfulness of their nature. Inevitably this return to the rigidity of Calvinistic scholasticism introduced illiberal and retrograde elements into Methodist theology. At this price was personal piety rehabilitated and the danger of degeneracy into apathy combated. Much superstition came back with the resurgence of emotion, and the lurid prospect of Hell was portrayed, not only as a menace to the gin-drinker (a threat allowed by Latitudinarian preaching), but as a probability for the respectable churchman unless he were converted and saved. John Wesley himself was a sound spiritual adviser no less than an indefatigable evangelist and constructive organiser. 'Of Calvinism, mysticism and antinomianism have a care,' he wrote in 1783, 'for they are the bane of true religion.' It would have been better for the Church of England if its evangelical revival had followed the Arminian universalism of Wesley instead of the sombre Calvinism of Whitefield.

The circumstances which provoked the breach between Methodism and the Established Church were the consequence largely of Wesley's acceptance of contemporary indifference to matters of church order. Convinced by the perusal of Bishop Stillingfleet's *Irenicon* of the primitive identity of the presbyterate and episcopate, he sat loosely to the episcopal constitution of the Church of England. Nor did he endeavour to train his lay preachers in the principles of churchmanship. The majority of his converts were either dissenters or individuals hitherto outside the purview of any religious society; and neither class of proselyte could be expected to share his sentiments of affection towards the church of his ordination. The inevitable logic of development drove them further from connection with the Established Church, and they carried Wesley against his desires

into circumstances of formal schism. At a time when the older dissenting bodies, disintegrated by the Unitarian tendencies of their pastors, seemed about to suffer absorption into the Church of England, the Methodist revival recreated dissent on an unprecedented scale and divided the forces of the Evangelical revival into the two camps of Churchmen and Separatists.

It has become the fashion under the influence of the Oxford Movement to speak slightingly of the Evangelical revival against which the High Church tradition was a reaction. Newman himself confessed that he 'had a thorough contempt for the Evangelicals,' and this scorn was elaborated and annotated by W. G. Ward in his *Ideal of a Christian Church*. Notwithstanding, it is necessary to understand the real services rendered by the Evangelicals to the Church and Nation. Granted that their theology represented a reversion to the rigid scholasticism of Calvin, their contribution to religion in the fields of personal piety and social humanitarian activity merits the highest appreciation of the historian. From the standpoint of personal religion their holiness was undoubted, and in the devotional poetry of Cowper this aspect of the revival found classic and persuasive expression. The gulf dividing the author of *Oh! for a closer walk with God*, *The Contrite Heart*, and *Grace and Providence* from *The Universal Prayer* of Pope is a measure of the religious transformation wrought by the Evangelicals. Instead of the optimistic confidence in the beneficence and reasonableness of God came the penitent's self-abasement in fear of condemnation :

> 'This man was happy, had the world's good word,
> And with it every joy it can afford.
> Friendship and love seemed tenderly at strife
> Which most should sweeten his untroubled life;
> Politely learned and of a gentle race,
> Good breeding and good sense gave all a grace. . . .
> Alas! how changed! Expressive of his mind,
> His eyes are sunk, arms folded, head reclined.
>
> Those awful syllables—hell, death and sin,
> Though whispered, plainly tell what works within,
> That conscience there performs her proper part
> And writes a doomsday sentence on his heart. . . .
> His hours no longer pass unmark'd away,
> A dark importance saddens every day;
> He hears the notice of the clock perplexed,
> And cries—Perhaps Eternity strikes next.'

This sombre piety was, however, the parent of a vigorous and positive activity in social service. The leaders of the Evangelical revival were distinguished by their zealous support of humanitarian reforms in the slave trade, in prison administration, and in education. The movement created new societies, designed to disseminate Evangelical teaching through the Religious Tract Society, or to carry its evangel *viva voce* to the heathen through the Church Missionary Society, or to distribute copies of Holy Scripture through the British and Foreign Bible Society. In the field of missionary enterprise the Evangelicals may claim a proud pre-eminence in the inspiration of that development by which the insular Church of England became a world-wide catholic communion. In the more immediate province of domestic politics its leaders were characterized in their humanitarian projects by an insistence upon the Christian vocation of the Nation, in contradistinction to the later Oxford emphasis upon the holy community of the Church. To the Evangelicals the nation was the royal priesthood and the holy people, required by the standard of Christian duty to give legal force and effect to their schemes of social reform. The value of this conception of the national obligation to assert Christian principles in the regulation of its social life does not stand in need of emphasis, for its importance in a healthy community is evident. The scope of the Christian vision of corporate responsibility suffered shrinkage when the Tractarian teaching of the Church as the *Civitas Dei* in the midst of an apostate people supplanted the Evangelical belief in the nation as the political agent for the creation of the *Regnum Dei* amongst men.

On the eve of the Reform Act of 1832 the Evangelical movement appeared not only dominant but almost impregnable in the Church. The excesses of the French Revolution, with its declension to atheism and regicide, had discredited the Age of Reason and its promised enlightenment. The Latitudinarian movement had spent its force, and within the Establishment the Evangelicals had no occasion to anticipate their eclipse. Towards the major question of the reform of the administration of the Church their leaders were indeed sympathetic, admitting the need for the redistribution of revenues, the reconstitution of cathedrals, the abolition of pluralism and the raising of the

status of the parish clergy, and were ready to co-operate with the Whigs in schemes of reconstruction. Towards the Dissenters, who were pressing for the removal of the remaining restrictions and symbols of inequality, they were friendly and conciliatory, sharing a common theology whilst preserving their loyalty to the doctrine and discipline of the Established Church as their past tradition had interpreted it. Their fundamental weakness lay in their refusal to learn from the discredited Latitudinarian tradition its essential lesson of the necessity of finding new theological expression for the principles of their spiritual experience. But the day for novel experiment and restatement had not yet dawned. The religious movement which swept away the predominance of the Evangelical school owed its inspiration not to the renewed demand for progress, but to the spirit of reaction. The romantic revival which looked back with sentimental unreality to an idealized picture of the Middle Ages, the ages of Faith, combined with the widespread sense of insecurity amidst political changes to proclaim the need for a return to authoritarian government in Church and State. In Europe the Ultramontane Movement and in England the Oxford Movement represented the reaction from a period of rationalistic criticism in religion and revolutionary experiment in statecraft. The fall of the Protestant ascendancy in the Church was the more complete in virtue of its protracted supremacy from the Revolution of 1688 to the Reform period of the 1830's; and the approaching eclipse of the Latitudinarian and Evangelical tradition afforded one more example of the truth so clearly inculcated by the successive religious movements within the Church of England since the Reformation that

> God fulfils Himself in many ways
> Lest one good custom should corrupt the world.

THE REFORMATION AND THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

By C. C. J. Webb, D.Litt.

THE great movement of the sixteenth century which we call the Reformation and which has been chosen to be the general subject of our discussions at this Conference, is represented on the continent of Europe by a twofold progeny—the group of Churches called Lutheran and the group of Churches called Reformed. These groups have in common the tradition of opposition to Rome; but in their ecclesiastical institutions, their relations to the State, their theology and their fashion of piety they differ very widely from one another. The national Church of England, which shares with both the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches the tradition of protest against the claims of the Roman See, from whose communion it severed itself in the sixteenth century, cannot be itself reckoned as a member of either of these groups. It exhibits features characteristic of each, and it is arguable that the well-known phrase about its 'Calvinistic creed and Popish liturgy' would have been expressed with greater historical accuracy had the word 'Lutheran' been substituted for 'Popish.' Yet, if the word 'Popish' is, as it is, misleading, since any recognition of the Roman See as the divinely appointed centre of Christian unity is as completely absent from the Anglican formularies of worship as from those of any Continental Protestant Church, it must be allowed that the word 'Lutheran' also would be misleading, since not only is there no trace in our Prayer-book of any reference to Luther himself or to Lutheran standards of doctrine; but the element which the Anglican tradition has in common with the Lutheran as distinguished from the Reformed version of Protestantism lies rather in its conservatism as regards the mediaeval structure of worship and ministry than in any noticeable conformity with the peculiar *ethos* which characterizes the type of religious thought and practice associated with the name of the great Saxon protagonist of the Reformation.

Any profitable study of the relation of the Oxford Movement to the Reformation must have in view the *English* Reformation —for the Oxford Movement was not only in its origin an entirely English movement, but its influence—which may be detected beyond the ecclesiastical or even the religious sphere of life—has been hitherto exerted almost wholly within the English-speaking countries; though we may now, I think, observe an extension of that influence to the Scandinavian Churches, an extension of which we have an indication in the Swedish theologian Dr. Brilioth's admirable study in his recent work on *The Anglican Revival.*

Moreover, the current of English religious life diverted by the Reformation from the channel controlled by the Roman See has since come to flow as it were in many separate beds, and by no means only in that to which the term 'Anglican,' originally applied to the whole organized Christianity of the English nation, is now by custom reserved. The Oxford Movement was, however, a movement within the Anglican Church in this narrower sense of the word, and, in speaking of its relation to the English Reformation, I shall have mainly in mind the English Reformation as represented by that body of English Christians which conforms to the ecclesiastical institutions established (with a few years' break in the middle of the seventeenth century) by the law of the land in this country for the last three centuries and a half.

In all the countries in which the Reformation obtained national recognition it was to a considerable degree inspired by an affirmation of the national self-consciousness revolting against the interference in the national life of an authority which claimed to represent that universal Christendom in the bosom of which the separate nationalities of Europe had grown to political maturity, but which had actually come, with the development of the Papacy into an Italian principality, to be identified with interests alien and sometimes hostile to those of the peoples whose spiritual allegiance it demanded. But in England this affirmation expressed itself in a way congruous with the national genius. The Lutheran tendency to abandon to the State the whole regulation of public life, while reserving to the Church that of private life, and the opposite Calvinistic tendency to

make the State the instrument of the Church's control over both public and private life were alike uncongenial to the English temperament. Thus, while impatience with State dictation in religious matters drove many Englishmen outside the national Church altogether, a like sentiment in the long run preserved even within that Church a consciousness of the distinction between spiritual and temporal authority which prevented the assumption by the English Sovereigns of the title of *summus episcopus* and led to their dropping that of 'supreme head of the Church.' On the other hand, the taste of ecclesiastical dictation in both public and private life experienced during the ascendency of the Genevan model under the Long Parliament permanently disgusted the general body of the nation with the Puritan State, notwithstanding the profound influence exercised by Puritan ideals on the religious and moral standards of the community.

The events of the civil war, the fall and subsequent restoration of the monarchy, resulted in confirming the Church of England in its insularity. It attached it to institutions, traditionally associated with the ancient monarchical constitution of the State, which differentiated it from the majority of the Protestant Churches of other lands, including the sister kingdom of Scotland; and especially from those called 'Reformed,' to which belonged both the established Church of Scotland after the failure of the Stuarts to restore episcopacy there, and also those Protestant communities abroad with which travelling Englishmen came most frequently into contact and whose theology had after the first stage of the English Reformation been far more directly influential in England both within and without the established Church than that of the Lutherans.

But this isolation of Anglicanism from other forms of Protestantism did not bring it at all nearer to Roman Catholicism. After the failure of James II's attempt to recover for the latter standing in this country, English Romanism ceased to be a power in the national life. Little in evidence except in a few districts and there regarded in the main as a peculiar tradition of certain families sentimentally attached to a dynasty which the nation had decisively rejected, 'Popery' was by the great majority of the people associated with stories of the Marian

persecution in the past, and, in the present, with foreigners, Spanish or French, who were frequently hostile to England and always sharply distinguished from Englishmen not merely by their language but by their social customs and political institutions.

However much, moreover, in the eyes of Reformed Protestants abroad or of dissentient Puritans at home the liturgical worship and episcopal ministry of the Church of England may have seemed dangerously akin to those of Roman, yet they were not, by those most deeply devoted to them, regarded as linking the Church of England with that of Rome in opposition to those who had left her communion at the Reformation. The Anglican schools of thought which had been least in sympathy with attempts to affiliate English religious life to that of continental Protestantism—the school of Hooker and Andrewes, of Laud and Cosin, even that of the later non-Jurors—always regarded themselves as belonging to the opposite camp to that of Rome in the Reformation controversy, and when they looked for allies beyond Protestant Europe, sought them in the Churches of the East which Rome called schismatic and which in their turn called Rome heretical.

In attempting to understand the relation in which the so-called Oxford Movement stands to the Reformation, we must then first realize the peculiarities which distinguish the national Church of England from others which had severed themselves in the sixteenth century from the communion of the See of Rome; but we must also bear in mind the more immediate background of the later movement in the great intellectual and political convulsions which at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries, while subverting or transforming the institutions of Church and State in most continental countries and profoundly affecting the thought and life of Englishmen, left the fabric of both intact in this country. To three important tendencies which were at work here and elsewhere when the Oxford Movement began, we may here call particular attention: one as having provoked that movement by way of reaction: one as having largely determined its direction and its form: and one as having specially affected the view taken of the Reformation by its representatives.

The first of these was the rationalistic and utilitarian tendency associated with the French Revolution, and in England with Whig politics, a tendency hostile to all emphasis upon theological orthodoxy and ecclesiastical authority, and inspired by a confident faith in the indefinite improvement of human life through its enrichment by inventions due to that constantly progressive knowledge of its material environment whereof the natural sciences were giving such abundant promise. This tendency (of which Macaulay became in the middle of the nineteenth century an eloquent exponent) is what the leaders of the Oxford Movement meant by the 'Liberalism' which they conceived themselves called to oppose as champions of the ancient faith, formerly common to all branches of the Christian Church, Protestant no less than Catholic, that the true interests of humanity were bound up, not with a civilization destined to perish along with the universe whose secrets the natural philosophers set themselves to explore, in a catastrophe which might happen at any moment; but with the development of a supernatural drama, the past acts of which were recorded and the future foretold in the pages of the Bible.

It would, however, be a mistake to represent the Oxford Movement as directed against natural science. It can only be so described in the sense in which the same might be said of Carlyle's contemporary protests against the same type of Liberalism; and, as a matter of fact, when a few years later the foundation of the new Museum gave a fresh impetus to the study of natural science at Oxford itself, there was no opposition offered to this development by the Tractarians under Pusey's leadership, but rather a measure of sympathetic support.

The second tendency in the thought of the period which must be kept in mind if one is to understand the Oxford Movement is that of which the mention of Carlyle may remind us. It is that of the Romantic Movement to counter a disintegrating and individualistic rationalism by an emphasis on the witness of feeling and of tradition to an experience wider and deeper than any individual's, but in which the individual's is rooted. With this appeal to elements in human nature which the so-called Enlightenment of the eighteenth century was apt to neglect went a new sympathy with those middle ages which that Enlightenment

was wont to despise, but in which were to be found the roots of that 'old *régime*,' men's faith in which the Enlightenment had undermined and which the Revolution, the child of the Enlightenment, had violently assailed and reduced to ruins. The attraction exercised upon the men of the Oxford Movement by the ideals from which the Enlightenment had turned away, whether those of seventeenth century loyalism in England or of the earlier period for which we usually reserve the epithet of 'mediaeval,' was experienced by them in common with other representatives of Romanticism; they were, indeed, themselves fully conscious of their debt to the great master of romance, who above all others had made these times live again in the imagination of his contemporaries, Sir Walter Scott. It is to be noted that it was chiefly the association of its claims with the history and art of the middle ages that imparted to the Roman Church the glamour which no doubt invested it in the eyes of many disciples of the Tractarians; it was not as a rule that Church as it had come to be after its losses at the time of the Reformation, a Church of 'miserable Tridentines,' as Hurrell Froude, the most vehement critic of the Reformers among the first Tractarians, called the Roman Catholics of his own day, but the Church whose communion had once embraced all the Christian nations of Western Europe had so often hovered before them as a pattern by which their own Church was to be remodelled.

The third of the tendencies to be taken into account as forming the immediate background of the Oxford Movement is that which was represented to the men of that movement by the Evangelicalism which they found prevalent in the religious world of their day. This tendency was akin to the first of the three which I have mentioned in its individualism and in its lack of sensibility to the charm of historical continuity and consequent indifference to the powerful attraction which the middle ages exercised upon the imagination of the men of the Romantic movement; but the *rationalism* which was characteristic of that first tendency was as abhorrent to the Evangelicals as to the Tractarians themselves. Now fidelity to the principles of the Reformation was a watchword of the Evangelicals; it was in the name of those principles that they suspected and resisted the attempts of the Tractarians to bring back into the life of the English Church a

sense of loyalty to the historical Catholic Church of Christ as a visible society with an organization of its own distinct from that of any Christian State, and linking in unbroken continuity the community to which the Apostles ministered with that of the present day. It is a feature often to be observed in reforming movements that their spokesmen are apt to regard the earlier movements, against certain objectionable results of which they are concerned to protest, not with historical dispassionateness or sympathetic appreciation, but merely as the fountain heads of the evils which they are themselves attacking. To Bacon, for example, Aristotle was often the patriarch of a degenerate scholasticism rather than the great scientific thinker who had furnished him with the basis of his own philosophy. In the same way the Tractarians sometimes came to look upon the Reformation merely as a movement responsible for the stereotyped Evangelicalism, with wealth and influence at its disposal, which stood in the way of that revival of a sense of loyalty to a Church older than the Reformation and wider than Protestant Christendom on which their hearts were set.

My allotted topic is, however, the relation of the Oxford Movement to the Reformation, not its relation to the Evangelicalism of the earlier nineteenth century. I only wish to remind you that the Tractarians could hardly avoid associating the Reformation with the party opposed to themselves in the controversies of their own day, of whose glorification of the Reformers the 'Martyrs' Memorial' in Oxford itself is a monument—and, at the same time, curiously enough, a monument, in its architectural structure and sculptural details, of the influence of the revival of admiration for mediaeval models associated with the Oxford Movement on ecclesiastical art even among its most pronounced theological opponents.

It is easy on a superficial view to regard the Oxford Movement as a reactionary attempt to undo the work of the Reformation; but only on a superficial view, which does not go beyond the externals of worship, and does not attend to the inner character of either the Reformation or the Oxford Movement. I should be more inclined to say that the Oxford Movement maintained on the whole the gains of the Reformation and was a reaction against it only so far as the Reformation was inevit-

ably a movement, even if, under the circumstances, a justified movement, towards the disunion of Christendom, while the Oxford Movement was from the first inspired by the vision of a truly Catholic Christian Church and has in the end made, and is indeed still making, a real contribution towards the realization of that vision. The recognition of this is quite compatible with allowing that the emphasis laid by Anglo-Catholics on the apostolical succession of the episcopate has often been disproportionate; although it should be recognized that even this emphasis has pointed the way to a more hopeful policy—hopeful, I mean, from the point of view of those who value the ideal of organic reunion—than could ever have been promoted by indifference to the principle of visible continuity in the Christian society.

No doubt, as concerns the 'face of religion,' the Oxford Movement has greatly altered the external appearance of Anglican (and not only of Anglican) churches from that which it found usual; and no doubt the character of this alteration is such as to make them less unlike mediaeval churches and services than they were before it took place. But there are Lutheran churches which (as Butler noted, when accused of 'popishly' putting a cross on the altar of his palace chapel) have always preserved some of those appurtenances of worship—such as crucifixes and chasubles—which have most offended the susceptibilities of Englishmen inclined to charge Anglo-Catholics with undoing the work of the Reformation. It is true that, with the cultivation by the extreme wing of the Anglo-Catholic party (to which alone the name Anglo-Catholic, the self-chosen appellation of the Tractarians, is now commonly applied) of devotion to the reserved Sacrament, there does re-appear a feature of mediaeval worship which one may without hesitation admit to have been deliberately abandoned by the English Reformers. It is, however, a feature which the leaders of the Oxford Movement did not countenance and which was unknown to the majority of the earlier generations of their followers. Moreover, the student of our present subject must, in considering this along with the whole development of Eucharistic worship in the Anglican Church, which has been one of the most conspicuous results of the Movement, take into account the following notable facts.

The Reformers found the Eucharist used as an opportunity of worship, but not, for the great majority of worshippers, of communion. Rightly conceiving this to be a perversion of the original institution, they would have no celebration where there were no communicants beside the celebrant; yet they certainly did not desire thereby to discourage frequency of communion, but rather the reverse. The actual custom was one of communion only once a year; the reformed English Church required of its children communion three times a year at least, and provided a weekly service which should, whenever there were a reasonable number of communicants, include a celebration. Both in England and in other Protestant countries, however, this intention to encourage more frequent communion was unsuccessful. The mass without communicants ceased to be, what it had been, the regular Sunday service; it was in practice replaced by another form of worship; by one of preaching and prayer only, as in the Reformed Churches; by mass with sermon but with the actual celebration left out, as in the Scandinavian churches; or by matins with the first part of the mass but without a celebration, as in our own. It cannot be denied that the Oxford Movement has succeeded where the Reformers failed. Within the sphere of its influence it has probably made communion more frequent among lay folk than it has been for ages in any considerable branch of the Church; I have known an Orthodox Roumanian candidate for orders even shocked at a frequency which he thought, possibly not without reason, must imply an insufficiently serious preparation. The daily celebration of the Eucharist, which seems so natural to us at a conference like this, is a striking proof of the success of the Oxford Movement in fulfilling an aspiration of the Reformers of which they signally failed to secure the fulfilment in their own days or for long afterwards. I deplore the insistence of not a few Anglo-Catholics of the present day, an insistence which I cannot bring myself to think to be other than superstitious, on the supposed necessity of approaching the Sacrament fasting; like the no less superstitious taboo against manual work on Sunday which was encouraged by a different school of Churchmanship and has so lamentably come in the imagination of many uneducated English folk to survive all other elements of Christian faith and

observance, it illustrates the proneness of the human heart to relapse into a sub-Christian form of religon; but it must be frankly admitted that there is no sign, in the circles where it exists, of any tendency to let the habit of communion lapse in favour of regular attendance at mass; stress may be laid on the latter, but there is no encouragement to anyone to treat frequent attendance thereat as a substitute for frequent communion.

It would, however, be absurd to deny that whereas, of the two traditional factors in Christian worship, the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments, it was characteristic of the Reformation that it exalted the former at the expense of the latter, the Oxford Movement aimed from the first at redressing the balance by laying stress on the latter. A religion whose fundamental doctrine is the incarnation of God in a historical person cannot utterly cast aside the sacramental principle of the use of material things as vehicles of spiritual grace or the recognition of the special significance of certain times and places as mere survivals of an outworn stage of religious development. It can as little be content to be reduced to what, in Kant's phrase, may be called a 'religion within the limits of mere reason' on the one hand as to be degraded into a business of propitiating the higher powers by an external ritual on the other.

The Reformation was provoked by a real sense of the danger that the latter fate might befall the religion of Christ; and it was a true re-formation in that it was what may be called the ethical and rational element in Christianity which from the first distinguished it from the generality of religions, and that any tendency to subordinate this involved a reversion to type in which the peculiar characteristic of our faith was liable to be submerged. But if Christianity is the religion *of the Spirit*, it is the *religion* of the Spirit; if it is the revelation of *the Word* incarnate, it is the revelation of the Word *incarnate*; and there is ever present in it a tension between two poles which it would be idle to suppose is less than essential to its life, a tension which can never fail to involve what the late Baron von Hügel was apt to call 'costingness,' and to make it impossible for Christianity to be such a faith as 'should not offend.' I should

myself think that the sacramentalism of the Anglo-Catholicism which traces its origin to the Oxford Movement was a valuable contribution to the integrity of our national Christianity, while I am no less certain that it has continually needed and needs the control supplied by a firm grasp of the ethical principles their adherence to which the leaders of the Reformation expressed by emphasizing St. Paul's doctrine that we are justified by faith and not by the works of the law. In applying this control a philosophical examination of the meaning of words like 'spirit' and 'matter' may be of great use; but the categories of natural science will be found, I venture to think, of little value here; although the scientific man's characteristic temper of humility, openness of mind and reluctance to dogmatize in fields in which he is not competent, will be found to be no less required than in physical science itself.

My allotted time is drawing to a close, and I must abandon any thought of dealing in so short a paper as this with the relation between the theology of the Oxford Movement and that of the Reformation; I have, however, attempted some slight discussion of this important subject in a small book, 'Religious Thought in the Oxford Movement,' especially in connexion with Newman's teaching on Justification. I will content myself at present with a few remarks upon three points bearing on our topic: (1) the attitude of the men of the Oxford Movement toward one great principle affirmed in the Reformation; (2) an important advance made in one respect by the Oxford Movement upon the position of the Reformers; (3) the relation of the Oxford Movement to the Roman claims which were rejected at the Reformation by the churches which received it.

(1) The great principle of the Reformation to which I would in the first place call attention is that of the establishment of a single moral standard for Christians and the consequent rejection of any recognition of a lower level of obedience to the divine *precepts* only and a higher of conformity to the so-called *counsels of perfection*. The affirmation of this principle not only issued in the abandonment of a rule of celibacy for the clergy, but incidentally involved the disappearance of those monastic institutions which seemed to deny that principle by

affording opportunity for the cultivation of a technically 'religious' life commonly supposed to transcend in merit that of the 'secular' Christian who discharges his duties as a householder and citizen.

The doctrine of 'two levels' of Christian conduct thus practically repudiated at the Reformation has in recent days been very persuasively defended by the late Baron von Hügel; and I am myself of opinion that he has at least shown the necessity of a restatement of the Reformation principle of a single moral standard, which should obviate the discouragement, which has sometimes followed upon its acceptance, of that passionate quest of personal sanctity which has inspired monasticism at its best. We may note in confirmation of this judgment the complaints which found utterance even in Luther's own household and often in the circle of the early Reformers that the new teaching did not in point of fact favour reverence and devoutness; and in later days the frequent occurrence of movements in Protestant Churches for the cultivation of personal holiness in opposition not only to a general surrounding worldliness, such as has again and again driven Catholics into the cloister, but to the failure of religious people to recognize the place in the Church's life of a peculiar call to the life of self-denial and religious retirement —a failure which may be said to be due to a 'corrupt following' of the Reformation principle which we are considering. I am thinking of such movements as German Pietism and, among ourselves, of the Methodist aspiration after sinless perfection and of the Keswick school of Evangelical piety. Now zeal for personal holiness was at the heart of the Oxford Movement. It was its ideal of the priestly life as a solemn self-sanctification for others' sake after Christ's example rather than as the undertaking of a profession concerned with the religious ceremonies and institutions established in the community much as the lawyer's is with those connected with property, which may fairly be said to have created a new standard of clerical aspiration, and that not only among those who could be called followers of the movement; while (if I may quote words I have used elsewhere) the successful restoration under Anglo-Catholic influence of monastic institutions alike for men and women is a significant result of their principles and an immediate consequence

of the Oxford men's reluctance to share the current Protestant suspicion of any cultivation of holiness which shall involve a withdrawal from the ordinary activities of householder and citizen. This restoration is, I believe on the whole, a happy revival of something without which the life of the Church is the poorer, even if its temporary loss at the time of the Reformation was inevitable. At the same time the refusal of both the Tractarians themselves and the great majority of their successors, even of the most advanced wing of their party, to demand celibacy from the clergy generally or to regard the married life as inconsistent with the sacerdotal has been to the last degree important as a security against any real Romanization of the Church of England, and implies the maintenance of the Reformation principle of a single standard, with which the recognition of a special vocation to a life of voluntary poverty and celibacy is in no way inconsistent, so long as this is not regarded as intrinsically more Christian than that of those who use wealth and family life as not abusing them.

(2) The circumstances of the Reformation brought it about that the Atonement wrought by Christ's death was so emphasized as the ground of Christian confidence in contrast with good works of our own performing that it was isolated from its context in the Incarnation; and indeed the concentration of devotion on the passion and death of the Saviour was the more inevitable that it was already a characteristic feature of Latin mediaeval piety as distinguished from that of the primitive Church. With the Tractarians (to quote Dr. Brilioth) 'the thought of sharing in the glory of the risen Lord preponderates over confidence in the atoning work of the Cross.' 'Easter overshadows Good Friday and makes its message only a part of its own,' and this 'undoubtedly is a revival, not merely a mechanical reproduction, of the primitive feeling.' Nor was it only the balance between the death and resurrection of Christ that the Tractarian theology rectified; it was, as Dean Church has pointed out, part of its mission to go back from an Evangelicalism which identified the '*Gospel*' with the scheme of redemption suggested by the Pauline Epistles to an emphasis upon the primacy for Christians of the *Gospels* and the record therein contained of the teaching of Jesus Himself. It is not necessary before my

present audience to lay stress on the real advance involved in this reincorporation of the atoning death of our Lord in a larger process of which it is only a part, this refusal to allow it to overshadow, as in so much Protestant theology it had tended to do, His earthly life on the one side and His resurrection on the other.

Parallel with this work of the Oxford Movement was its reincorporation of the Bible in the general body of Christian tradition. Here too the Reformation had, for intelligible reasons, in its polemic against the reckless deductions of mediaeval theology, the meticulous elaboration of mediaeval ritual, and the accumulated mass of legend and custom with which popular credulity and an uncritical habit of mind had encumbered the faith and practice of Latin Christianity, fallen back upon the canonical Scriptures, whose privilege of inerrancy was already acknowledged; and thereby paved the way for a bibliolatry which has notoriously stood in the way of later theological progress and hampered the freedom of enquiry in all departments. The Tractarians were as far as possible from wishing to deny the infallibility of the Bible. They were for the most part as 'fundamentalist' (to use the now current term) as their Evangelical opponents, though they followed other guides than they in their interpretation of the inspired text. But it cannot be denied that by declining so completely to isolate the Bible from the general body of Christian tradition they prepared the way for a critical study of Scripture and a liberal attitude in regard to its contents which after the stage in the history of Anglo-Catholicism associated with the appearance of *Lux Mundi* has, one may say, made itself at home among Anglo-Catholic theologians.

(3) This last development alone marks the great gulf which parts the school of the Oxford Movement from the Church of Rome, which, by an odd irony of fate, many who have been in the habit of vilifying it for its neglect of Scripture, must now admit to be in the Christian world the great stronghold of the 'fundamentalism' from which the educated part of the Protestant world has so rapidly and completely fallen away. But in fact, despite the attraction which Rome, with its not unjustified claim to realize a supranational unity of belief and worship such

as can nowhere else be found, with its majestic appearance of systematic completeness in doctrine and in order, and with its long experience in the technique of piety, has naturally exercised over the disciples of a school which especially treasures the ideals of Catholicity, of spiritual authority, and of the disciplined religious life; it is nevertheless true of the Oxford Movement as a whole, as Newman is related to have said of its great leader Pusey when asked after his own submission to Rome if his late colleague were any nearer to the Roman Church, that he never was near to it at all. The *ethos* of contemporary Anglicanism, to the formation of which the Oxford Movement has unquestionably contributed much, is no doubt different from that of the greater part of Protestant Christendom; but it is also quite different from that of the Roman Church. The late Dr. Rashdall used to repeat with relish the remark of a Roman Catholic who said of an extreme Anglo-Catholic that he seemed to hold everything that he himself did, but held it for the totally irrelevant reason that he believed it to be true; whereas the faith which ranks as a theological virtue consists in believing solely on the authority of divine revelation. Without taking the remark too much *au grand sérieux*, it is a genuine illustration of the profound gulf which may divide groups, an external inspection of which might suggest that the one is a mere imitation of the other. There has been no doubt a good deal of deliberate Romanizing from time to time carried on by Anglo-Catholics during the whole history of the Oxford Movement and of the party in the Church which has carried on its tradition; but the spirit of Anglo-Catholicism is, for good or evil, very different from that of Roman Catholicism. Its main difference is closely connected with its incorrigible attachment, practical if not theoretical, to that principle of 'private judgment' for which the Reformation stood. As its maintenance of the right of the clergy to marry has helped to keep at bay a certain aloofness from the general life of the nation which many Roman Catholics (even when they think that the advantages of clerical celibacy outweigh its disadvantages) would no doubt acknowledge to be prejudicial to their own priesthood: so too its impatience of anything like the strict control which the centralized organization of the Roman system enables its ecclesiastical authorities

to exercise over the expression of opinion has preserved it from obscurantism, and made it possible for such a review as *Theology*, while definitely associated with Anglo-Catholic principles, to set an example to all religious journals of true liberality of outlook and freedom from partisan bitterness.

In my little book already mentioned I represented the original Oxford Movement as fighting a battle on a double front—on the one hand against any undervaluing of the moral consciousness (such as has sometimes accompanied emphasis on a purely substitutionary theory of the Atonement, or on the supreme importance of individual religious feeling), and on the other hand against the secularization of thought and life by the rationalistic and utilitarian spirit of nineteenth century radicalism. So far as the tendencies thus opposed had, as no doubt they had, their roots in the Reformation, the Oxford Movement was a reaction against it; but a reaction which, speaking generally, remained within its ambit as a protest against the claims of a supreme ecclesiastical authority, invested with the vicariate of Christ's headship, to bring the human spirit into a subjection inconsistent with the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free.

THE BASIS OF CHURCH UNITY

By Canon B. H. Streeter, D.D., F.B.A., Ireland Professor of Exegesis in the University of Oxford.

MY paper is entitled the 'Basis of Church Unity,' and I accept responsibility for that title. But as I came to think out in detail what I should say on that theme, it was borne in upon me that a more profitable subject to explore is the Basis of *Disunion*. A wise physician has little hope that he will cure the patient, unless he has correctly diagnosed the disease.

As a preliminary to such a diagnosis, I will suggest that the Basis of Disunion is the infirmity of human nature. The Church may be the vehicle of a Divine Spirit; but as St. Paul lamented, the treasure is carried in earthen vessels. And since earthen vessels are easily broken, it is not perhaps remarkable that the Church of Christ has been shivered into fragments. In every other department of life the infirmity of human nature expresses itself in misunderstanding, prejudice, hatred and internecine conflict, not only between individuals but between groups of men—between nations, between classes, between economic interests. It is not, therefore, surprising that the infirmity of human nature has resulted in the phenomenon of a similar bitterness and conflict between difficult religious groups. It is not surprising—but it is extremely discreditable. It is especially discreditable for this reason: it is part of the *raison d'être* of the Church to be a light to the world, and in this matter of group prejudice and hostility it has sunk to the level of the world. Indeed there have been periods in history where the Church in this respect has sunk to a level actually lower than the world.

No doubt, the existence of division of this kind among Christians has always been officially deplored. But this has resulted merely in lamentations, for the simple reason that everybody has explained the deplorable situation as being due to the other man's fault. The professional theologians have backed up the prejudice of the Church and of the rank and file by elaborating theories of the nature of the Church which, on grounds of Scripture, history or theological principle, prove

beyond question how very wrong those other fellows are. Libraries groan with treatises on the nature of the Church by Roman Catholics, Greek Orthodox, Anglican, Presbyterian, Independent and other divines. Some of the writers are learned, some are not; some are great thinkers, some are the reverse; some treat those who disagree with virulence, others with more or less of tolerant sympathy. But the underlying idea in them all is that to which frank expression was given by the eighteenth century controversialist, who gave his book the immortal title, 'A Short Way with Dissenters.'

But in spite of all these 'Short Ways,' the Dissenters are still there. Even the Anglican Church, which has the hardihood to dissent from the whole of Western Christendom, Protestant as well as Catholic, is still there—it has survived four centuries of refutation.

It would seem, then, that what is required is not A Short Way with Dissenters, but A Short Way with Human Nature. And after all that is what the Christian Religion was meant to be—though hitherto, again owing to the infirmity of the human instrument, it has only succeeded in realizing that purpose on a relatively small scale.

But to diagnose the Disunion of Christendom as due to the infirmity of human nature will be misleading unless we realize that, whatever its origin, its continuance is not mainly due to those elements in human nature which can easily isolate and label as the grosser vices. Some friends of mine, who visited Russia this summer, brought back a large number of the posters with which buildings and factories are there plentifully decorated. These mainly depict the Pope, Bishops, Imperialists and Capitalists—all with grossly-fed bodies and demoniac expressions, who in one way or another are maltreating virtuous-looking workers. On one occasion when visiting a factory my friends enquired why, on their entry, the girls at work broke out laughing and began exchanging remarks. The guide informed them that the girls were saying, 'Why, they are thin! We thought all capitalists were fat.'

Such generalizations are not confined to Russia. You and I have often met, not only thin capitalists, but bishops who are ardent for reunion. And if the existence of the institution of

episcopacy is one cause of the disunion among Christians, that is not because either bishops, or the Christian leaders who object to episcopacy, are sinners above all those that dwell in Jerusalem.

Much of the hostility between nations is due to ignorance of what kind of persons the men and women of other races really are, what they think, want and do, and why they do so? Still more is it due to insufficient acquaintance with the historical circumstances, which have made it all but inevitable that they shall feel in the way they do in regard to certain other nations, customs or events—which explains why names which are music in the ears of one people are an abhorence to another. The same thing holds of the divisions between Christians; but with this difference, that the mere claim to be a Christian at all is a challenge to acquire the knowledge and the sympathetic understanding that can rise above these barriers.

More serious is a falsely conscientious fear of 'sacrificing principles,' proper in its place so long as it is checked by a recognition of the general obligation *to re-examine all accepted principles* from time to time, to see whether, under the ever-changing circumstances of life, they are still *the best possible expression of the mind of Christ.* Here Popes, Bishops, and Non-Conformist Divines have been equally at fault.

It would seem, then, worth while to examine the *principles* on which in different ages have been supposed to constitute the fundamental basis of Church Unity.

(1) In the Jewish Church of the time of our Lord the accepted principle was the duty of *obedience to the Law* of Moses—a Law which included rules of morality, regulations as to matters of ritual and ceremonial obligation, and what nowadays would be called 'pious customs' or rules of religious discipline. It is one of the darkest facts in the history of religion that, when Christ came and challenged some points in the Law, it was the men of principle, the men who were ready to die for their faith, who took the lead in the agitation which led to His crucifixion. It was this same adherence to principle that, when the clear issue of the Law or the Gospel was forced again into view by the work of St. Paul, led the Jewish nation as a whole to reject Christianity, and thus to turn their backs upon their Divine call

to be 'a light to lighten the Gentiles,' as the permanent home-base of the Gentile mission.

(2) By this default of the Jew, the leadership in the Christian Mission was given into the hands of the Greek. The Greek had been led to look upwards by a line of great philosophers. He had sought after wisdom, and not wholly in vain. To him naturally the intellectual expression of religious truth seemed the one thing vital. Inevitably, under his intellectual dominance, *orthodoxy* became the *principle* upon which the unity of the Church was based. This idea that uniformity of belief in regard to highly disputable points of doctrine was a matter *stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae* led the Church for six centuries to dissipate upon speculative theological controversies the energy which, otherwise directed, might possibly have brought about a regeneration of the civilization of antiquity. In the end it split the Church.

(3) The Roman, like Dr. Johnson, believed that 'order cannot be had but by subordination.' The Western Church developed an all but Jewish system of legal religion, it accepted the Greek conception of orthodoxy, but in the last resort it made *subordination* the basic principle of Church unity. In this regard the modern Roman Church has completed what the Middle Ages began — obedience in thought or act to the absolute supremacy of the Pope is undisguisedly the principle upon which the unity of the Church is made to depend. It is significant that in this branch of the Church the accepted phrase for becoming a member of the body of Christ is 'to make one's submission to the Church.' History does not suggest that the *principle* adopted by Rome has been a complete success. It was this 'principle of unity' which at the Reformation broke up the Church.

Let us now cast our thoughts back to the principle of unity enunciated by St. Paul, 'One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and father of us all.'

(1) We need not repeat the mistake of the Greek and insist on uniformity in the intellectual definition of the philosophic meaning of the word 'Lord,' or interpret 'faith' as acceptance of dogmatic formulae rather than as loyalty to a common Master.

(2) We need not demand, because in any corporate body a certain amount of customary usage is necessary, and therefore some ceremony and some sacred symbolism is required to mark off the Christian society from the non-Christian world—that, therefore, the implication of the words 'one baptism' should be extended till we have an elaborate system of ceremonial obedience?

(3) Recognize 'one God and Father for us all,' and we know that—in spite of all differences of race, history, language and temperament—it must be we who are at fault if we forget that we are brothers, pledged to be *fellow-soldiers* in a great campaign.

All attempts to find a basis of reunion must fail, so long as each party enters upon negotiations with the proclamation, 'We cannot sacrifice our principles'—meaning by 'principles' precisely those interpretations of religious obligation which have been a main cause of the disunion it is sought to remedy.

A sacrifice is required—the sacrifice of the *egoism*, corporate rather than individual, which supposes it has been given to me and my little group alone to inherit *principles*, which exactly and in all ways correspond to the divine intention. It is not conscience, it is self-deception, to believe that one's own principles are infallible. The Christian gazes on an infinite ideal; therefore he is already beginning to backslide who has ceased to daily learn more and more of Christ; and to do this means constantly to revise principles, that they may conform to a vision of truth and goodness that to the true disciple must ever be growing clearer. And if the individual must cease to be truly Christian when he has ceased to go on learning—how much more so the community, which is to inspire the individual and sustain him in the following of Christ?

THE NEW REFORMATION

By H. D. A. Major, D.D., F.S.A., Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

IN the nineties of last century the chaplain of the Senate of the United States said: 'The nineteenth century will be known as the age of the mechanical forces; the twentieth century will be known as the age of the moral forces.'

To many the first third of the twentieth century will seem to have made a very bad beginning in the fulfilment of this prediction. The drone of the aeroplane and the roar and clatter of the motor-lorry and motor-bicycle keep on increasing in volume and violence. Plainly our civilization is not becoming less mechanical, nor is it likely to do so. The engineer, blessedly for the welfare and progress of humanity, has a great future before him, as well as behind him, as the Irishman remarked. How enormously has he increased mankind's productive power, how enormously has he facilitated the beneficent distribution of wealth. How cheering is the prospect which he gives of enlarging leisure to toil-worn men. Every engineer is a Noah—a source and means of rest. His father 'called his name Noah, saying, This same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands' (*Genesis* v, 29). Samuel Butler's account of the fight for supremacy in Erewhon between men and machines, with the final triumph of men and the destruction of machines, is a fantastic dream due to a surfeit of Ruskin and Preraphaelitism. Butler's dream will never be realized in humanity's waking hours, and although pessimists lament the increasing mechanization of life, it would be a disaster of immense dimensions if machinery were abolished. Among the blessings for which we thank God in the General Thanksgiving, we might well include machinery, with the added petition that we may always use it for the welfare of mankind.

While the mechanical forces are growing stronger, many will urge that the moral forces are growing weaker. I see no conclusive evidence of moral decline. There is less cruelty and criminality, less drunkenness and prostitution in our modern civilization. There is a wider outlook, a more real sense of

human solidarity, an increasing humanitarianism, a growing resolution to reduce human misery, and to make life enjoyable for all. There may be a good deal of materialism in the modern Utopian ideal, but this is largely redeemed by its philanthropy. The cult of athleticism, the vast increase in the less harmful forms of gambling, the use of contraceptives not for eugenic, but for immoral purposes, although these things are to be deprecated, they are far less socially and personally detrimental than the vices and tempers which are being expelled.

Two great dangers beset the New Reformation on its moral side. (1) The first is the insidious tendency to make the possession of ideals of universal philanthropy and international peace a substitute for self-discipline and unselfish and strenuous personal service.

(2) The second great moral danger lies in the misuse of our increasing leisure. How apt the warning in St. Paul's churchyard, '*The soul is dyed the colour of its leisure thoughts*.' It is not its hours of work, but its hours of leisure which are fraught with danger to a nation's character. Béranger said, 'I care not who makes a nation's laws, if I write its songs.' Dr. Johnson said, 'Sir, believe me, a man is seldom more innocently employed than when he is engaged in making money.' The mentor of childhood, Dr. Isaac Watts, wrote for his young charges, 'Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands to do.' A people's leisure may become the chief means of corrupting and vulgarizing it, and of depriving it of the moral and mental virtues won in times of toil. All who have the nation's welfare at heart should do all they can to fill its leisure with healthful, innocent, and ennobling recreations. Its leisure time can be made the great educational time of the adult nation. So to educate that leisure may be well spent is the great moral task of the New Reformation. How much do we in England owe to the B.B.C. in this matter? But we need many other such educational and recreational agencies.

When we turn to the religious aspect of the New Reformation a no less difficult task awaits the reformer. I am compelled on this occasion to confine myself chiefly to the Church of England, but not, I hope, in the spirit of Parson Thwackem's *dictum*:

> 'Now when I say Religion, I mean the Christian Religion, and when I say the Christian Religion, I mean the Protestant Religion, and when I say the Protestant Religion, I mean the Church of England.'

There is much religion outside the Church of England, and much Christian religion outside the limits of organized Christianity, but the Church of England occupies a central position in both the religious and the Christian world. What it accomplishes will affect not merely the Anglican Communion, but ultimately all Christendom, and the great religions outside Christendom. That is why it is of such crucial importance that the Church of England should take the right line in the new age.

When we survey the Church of England probably all will agree that as an institution it is losing influence. Dr. Henson in the *Times* of August 22nd wrote of 'these days of triumphant secularism,' and was trenchantly answered by Sir Arnold Wilson, who showed how soundly Christian our nation is, and not least, its great representative assembly, the House of Commons. *Diffused* Christianity is strong in this country, but *organized* or *institutional* Christianity is weak and is growing weaker. It was no doubt to this fact that Dr. Henson referred. I for one wish to see the Church stronger for the nation's sake, but it can only be stronger if it is going to live for the nation and not for itself. Of late it has been doing a great deal of living for itself as a study of Church Assembly proceedings shows. It is not to be blamed for this. There was need for it to set its house in order—and quotas, and clergy pensions, and systems of Church patronage, and so on, are all part of this undertaking, but our Lord's words apply here: 'These things ought ye to have done and not to have left the others undone.'

What are these other things left undone? Some will reply, the pastoral functions of the clergy. Their failure in many cases to reach the Christian standard of life and ministerial efficiency. I think it is only fair to say that the lives of the great majority of the clergy are exemplary. I doubt if the standard of ministerial activity and unworldliness has ever been as high since the days of Constantine the Great. There is no need to write to-day of our English clergy in the way in which St. Peter Damiani in his *Liber Gomorrhianus*, dedicated to Pope Leo IX, wrote of the clergy of Southern Europe in the eleventh century:

'Heu pudet dicere, pudet tam turpe flagitium sacris auribus intimare.'

It is not because of clerical slackness and moral failure that the Church is losing its grip to-day; it is because it is adhering to the forms of a traditionalist theology which in some cases it has not the will, in other cases the ability, in other cases the courage, to bring up-to-date. We all know the vast change which the new learning has wrought in man's outlook on life, and his conception of the universe. The core of the Christian religion is sound: its spirit is still potent, but its theology needs an immense purgation, simplification, and modernization. This new outlook is not merely intellectual: it is also moral and spiritual. The necessary adjustment, we may confess, is no easy matter, and so the Church authorities seem willing to do almost anything rather than face it. In order to escape from such an undertaking some would gladly disestablish the Church of England and incorporate it into the Church of Rome.

The Copernican astronomy, strategraphical geology, biological evolution, the sciences of anthropology and comparative religion, the higher historical and literary criticism of the Bible, these and many other branches of knowledge were unknown or unaccepted by the composers of the *Summa* of St. Thomas and the Tridentine Decrees, the *Institutes* of Calvin and the Westminster Confession, the XXXIX Articles and the Baptismal and Conciliar Creeds. The view of the Bible, the view of the Universe, the view of mankind, upon which they are based have all changed, but they still occupy their position of authority. The protagonist for the New Reformation has no wish to change these historic documents. He pleads with the Church authorities to frame modern alternatives which can be used in the Christian Church for purposes of instruction, guidance, and profession. Furthermore he pleads also that if the old formulae be retained they shall be open to a liberal reinterpretation in the light of modern knowledge. We desire the Church authorities courageously to do both these things and to do them in no pettifogging way. Any number of admirable men are being lost to the Christian ministry, multitudes of people of goodwill are being lost to the Christian Church because our Church authorities have not the resolution to do what the great

Fathers of the Reformation did, what the great Doctors of the Scholastic Movement did, what the greatest of the ancient Fathers such as St .Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and St. Athanasius did. We plead for this purgation, simplification and modernization of Christian dogma because the future usefulness and recovery of the Church of England depend upon it. If it be not granted the Church must cease to be a great national institution — the *Ecclesia gentis Anglorum* as the Venerable Bede named it twelve centuries ago—and become a dwindling sect. For fifty years past, and indeed for very much longer, this reform of our Church dogma has been desired by Englishmen of the most varied types. I will give but one example, and that because he was one of the most original and courageous thinkers of the nineteenth century—in many ways a worthy successor of that great Renaissance genius Sir Thomas More. I refer to Samuel Butler, the author of *Erewhon*. He wrote to a friend in 1887 :

> 'Do you—does any man of science—believe that the present orthodox faith can descend many generations longer without modification? Do I — does any free-thinker who has the ordinary feelings of an Englishman—doubt that the main idea underlying and running through the ordinary orthodox faith is substantially sound?
>
> 'I want the Church as much as I want free-thought; but I want the Church to pull her letter more up to date or else to avow more frankly that her letter is a letter only. If she would do this, I for one would not quarrel with her. Unfortunately, things do not seem moving in the direction in which I would gladly see them go and do all in my power to help them go.' *

The root of the evil is that the Church is cursed with an avowed or implicit belief in the infallibility of its past, and has no real faith in the present progressive guidance and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, which would enable it to meet with inspired insight, the successive crises in its history.

Hence the Church is always looking backward for guidance to the decisions of the Church in the past, and as a consequence diminishes its efficiency as an agent of the Kingdom of God. Since the past can be no infallible guide for the present, and the present can be no infallible guide for the future, 'Let the dead bury their dead.'

Until we can get dogmatic reform sound liturgical reform is held up and becomes simply the policy of opportunist conces-

* *Samuel Butler: a Memoir,* by Henry Festing Jones, Vol. II, p. 53.

sions. Not only is liturgical reform bound up with dogmatic reform, but also questions of reunion with the Free Churches. They are much more free in their Theology than we are. The best elements in them will not consent to be shackled theologically as we are. Yet unless we can get greater dogmatic truth and freedom, our traditionalists will insist that the Free Churches be required to accept the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds as the basis of reunion.

Dogmatic Reform is of extreme importance in the Foreign Mission Field — as important there as in the Home Mission Field. Educated Japanese and Chinese pagans are not going to accept these ancient creeds as a condition of entering the Christian Church. This is equally true of potential converts from Islam and Hinduism. The Christian Church needs to-day a theology which expresses itself in terms of the spirit, such as we have admirably set forth in Professor Raven's *Creator Spirit*.

It is often urged by those who really wish to defeat dogmatic reform that it is the Thirty-nine Articles which need revision. No doubt they do, but the revision of the Thirty-nine Articles is a minor issue in the matter of dogmatic reform, although a very controversial one. The Articles are only subscribed to by the clergy, and that in a deliberately general way provided for by the Amended Act of Subscription. The clergy only have to do with the Articles in connection with ordination and the holding of benefices; but with the creeds it is far otherwise. All Churchmen, clergy and laity alike have to do with them, and perpetually—at Baptism, at Confirmation, at Holy Communion, as well as at the weekly and daily services. When they repeat the Creeds they wish above all things that their words should say what they mean and mean what they say. Yet it is not so. Many do not believe in the Virgin Birth; many do not believe in the Resurrection of the Flesh; many do not believe in the physical Ascension of Christ; many do not believe that Christ will come again at the end of the world to judge the quick and the dead. Yet they are loyal Christians; they strive to be practising Christians: they are as I should hold, orthodox Christians. Take for instance Christ's return in the clouds. We know now that it was a Jewish Messianic Expectation which the Primitive

Church accepted, putting Jesus in the centre of the picture. We know the troubles caused to the Church by the non-fulfilment of the Apocalyptic Hope. Modern Christians believe in the Coming of the Kingdom of God on earth: they believe in a process of divine judgment in human history: they believe also in the gift of Eternal Life here and hereafter. Is it unreasonable that we should press upon our authorities that they should give us a creed or creeds which state what we do believe in these matters, and not what we do not believe, that is, if we are required to express our belief about it at all? Some will say it is not necessary to have creeds which include so much as ours do. The Primitive Church had a creed consisting of but one clause; need ours have more? I would reply the New Reformation demands new creeds. Already such are in existence, but they are not authorized. A good example of such a creed is the following taken from the writings of S. John:

We believe:

God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.

God is Light, and if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.

God is Love, and everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God.

Jesus is the Son of God, and God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son.

We are children of God, and He hath given us of His Spirit.

If we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.

The world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever. AMEN.*

Details of creed-content can be best decided after our Church authorities have conceded the principle of the duty to provide new creeds. Let us hope that the Archbishops' Doctrinal Commission, appointed in 1923, will shortly provide for this pressing need. Of course, the Commission may take up the position that only a General Council of the Church can formulate new creeds. This appeal to a General Council, as Stubbs and Dibdin have pointed out, is tantamount to asking for the moon and a refusal to act until we get it, for there is not the

* This creed is included in *Songs of Praise* (Second Edition), No. 433, with a musical setting by Martin Shaw.

slightest chance of such a General Council meeting. Nearly four hundred years ago Cranmer appealed to the next General Council, and we are still awaiting it. We English Churchmen who are sons of the Reformation believe in the right of National Churches to provide for the spiritual and moral needs of their people, and claim that we have at least as much right to formulate in new creeds our convictions as had the Christian Churches of the first three centuries. If the New Reformation fails to achieve dogmatic reform soon, the forces of secularism, agnosticism, and indifferentism will go on increasing in magnitude.

I turn to another task of the New Reformation. The Protestant Reformation began by splitting Western Christendom asunder, and then with its belief in the supreme authority and infallibility of Holy Scripture and the rights of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture split Protestant Christendom into a hundred sects. The New Reformation must and will heal these schisms and unite the Reformed Churches in a great fellowship of Christian work and life, permeated by the Spirit of Christ, which can alone unite Christendom. Such a union demands for its realisation a very simple, adaptable, and many-sided institutional life as its essential constitution. Its essential and uniting creeds must be very simple : its sacraments must be capable of great variety and width of interpretation : its organization must be very flexible. Neither Christian union nor Christian progress nor Christian comprehensiveness can be secured without this simplification and flexibility. The spirit of truth and freedom and comprehensiveness are of much greater value than corporate reunion. Nevertheless, corporate reunion in the face of militant secularism and materialistic hedonism would be of real value. There are many signs that reunion is coming. The New Reformation will, when the reunion of Reformed Christendom is secured, guard against the obvious defects of Bibliolatry, Protestant Scholasticism, sectarianism, intolerance and the ugly and vulgar aspects of Puritanism which defaced the Old Reformation.

The New Reformation will take its stand on the position that all positive institutions are subordinate to eternal principles and that no particular positive institutions are essential; although on the other hand it must realise that if ideals are to

exercise their full effect in human society they must be embodied in institutions. The New Reformation must seek to secure a Christian Church wide enough to have a place for both dogmatic and non-dogmatic Christians, for both Sacramental and Non-Sacramental Christians. Many will say it cannot be done—no Christian Church could be wide enough to do this. Did not Bishop Creighton say, 'There is the right of the individual to be free, and there is the obligation of the institution to be something'? You cannot harmonise those claims 'so as to include in one body dogmatic and non-dogmatic, sacramental and non-sacramental Christians.'

Now I claim that just in so far as we are Christians this is the very thing we can do. But it can be done in only one way, and that is by returning to Christ's standard of values. These were neither dogmatic nor sacramental nor institutional, but moral and spiritual. All Church organizations, sacraments, regulations and institutions are in the light of Christ's teaching, secondary and non-essential, therefore it is not these things but only the things that Christ stressed which may rightly be made the test of Church membership and Christian life. The Christian Religion is a life of love to God and man. Its adherents are all recognisable by their character, conduct, and spirit. That is the test of discipleship according to the teaching of Jesus Christ. Even calling Him 'Lord' does not count with Him in comparison with obedience to the Divine Will, likeness to the Divine character, the penetration of personalities and societies by the Divine Spirit. Of course the Christian religion must have an organisation. It must secure combination and order together with the spirit of freedom and fellowship. It has to have a church and a ministry, but they can only be good servants when they are recognised as means to an end, and not ends in themselves. The New Reformation must expel ecclesiolatry as firmly as it must expel bibliolatry. They are both contrary to the religion of Christ, which is primarily and essentially the religion of the Spirit. The Christian Church must be a Spirit-borne and Spirit-bearing Church, and every member of it a Spirit-borne and Spirit-bearing person.

The New Reformation has its task cut out. Traditionalism, clericalism, ecclesiasticism have all been on the increase in the

Church of England during the last three generations. They have driven multitudes out of the English Church. The clericalists have produced and are producing hordes of secularists, and the more zealous and active the clericalists are, the stronger the secularist forces in this country will become, and wider and deeper the division between them. We of the New Reformation have a battle on two fronts. We have to convert the secularists to an attitude of sympathy with essential Christianity and with this campaign to free traditional Christianity from its fetters and *impedimenta*, its entangling traditions and its materialistic valuations: and on the other hand we have to persuade the clericalists and the traditionalists to put first things first; to value things that Christ valued, to put principles above precepts, to regard no particular ecclesiastical institution, whether the Mass or the Episcopate, as essential. Yes, a hard task, and harder perhaps to win the clericalists than the secularists. If the New Reformation fails, the Christian Religion as the religion of the human race is doomed.

Two intensely practical problems face the New Reformation. The greater of the two is this: Ought the New Reformation to create a new Christian Church or should it strive to leaven and reform existing Christian Churches? As a Modernist, I believe in the latter policy. 'Modernism,' said Mrs. Humphry Ward, 'is the attempt of the modern spirit, acting religiously, to refashion Christianity, *not outside*, but inside the warm limits of the ancient churches, to secure not a reduced but a transformed Christianity.' This is an educational task which demands prolonged, patient, wise, and many-sided labour. It is not so dramatic nor so attractive nor so easy as to form a new Church, but I think one lesson of the old Reformation is to work from within, not from outside. Our English bottle is not so old and stiff that the new wine will burst it.

The second of the two problems is concerned with the part, if any, which the nation should play in this New Reformation. In other words, can the Church of England reform itself or does it need the assistance of the State to enable the New Reformation to be accomplished? All our clericalists will hold up their hands in horror at this suggestion and shout 'Erastianism' at the top of their voices. We do well to recall

that the English Nation represented by English Statesmen played no insignificant or feeble part in the Reformation of the sixteenth century. Beard in his truly masterly monograph on *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century* (Hibbert Lectures, 1883) notes the very singular character and quality of the Reformation in England, and he asserts as a proof of this that after the lapse of three centuries one cannot say 'whether the Church of England is Protestant or Catholic' (p. 301, 1907 edition).

Beard shows that the Reformation in England was due to the same general causes as the Continental Reformation, but he stresses with repugnance and grief a singular and essential factor in our English Reformation. He writes:

> 'But an unpleasant truth, which I think an impartial inquirer cannot help gathering from the records of the English Reformation, is that its motive power was at least as much political as religious.'

Acu tetigisti. English statesmen, sovereigns and parliaments played a leading part. There were defects in their methods. Mr. Birrell has spoken of our 'barbarously conducted Reformation.' Yes, there was barbarity but there was strength, there was ruthlessness but it was combined with clearness and breadth of vision. 'The wrath of men shall turn to thy praise,' sings the Psalmist, so it did in the Reformation of the Church of England. Had the Reformation depended simply on our bishops and clergy, we should have had no Reformation at all, or one of very much worse quality. Sir Lewis Dibdin, in his recent volume *Establishment in England*, teaches his readers the same lesson. But it causes that distinguished lawyer and Churchman no grief, for he judges of the quality of the agent by the effects it accomplishes. Not only the sixteenth century reform of the Church of England, but all great and effective reforms of the Church of England since then have been brought to fruition and been given their particular quality of breadth, sanity, and moderation by English statesmen. There is the moral and spiritual authority of the State as well as the moral and spiritual authority of the Church; both may be and are agencies of the Spirit of God, and I think it must be confessed that Parliament of recent years, when judged by its fruits, has more to show than the Church.

There are many evidences that the Church of England ad-

ministration is becoming feeble; that reactionary elements in our Church life are securing ascendancy, that our Bishops, however great their goodwill, so far from being able to secure reform, will not even be able to check retrogression. The nation has given the Church by the Enabling Act of 1919 a large measure of self-government for the express purpose of assisting it to set its house in order. The Church gladly accepted the terms of that arrangement with the State, and the nation is watching the use the Church is making of its power, but with a declining confidence and sympathy. Should the Church authorities fail to put an end to Romanizing within the Church of England—there is no room for two Roman Churches in England—then the State will have to take the Church of England in hand once again, and I hope re-establish it on such an enlightened, comprehensive, and spiritual basis as to unite in Christian fellowship all the active forces of good-will in the nation to serve that nation's higher life. This rather than a negative policy of disestablishment and disendowment is alone worthy of English statesmanship should the need for the exercise of that statesmanship arise. The Church of England, if we look at its potentialities, is too great a possible source of benign national service to be ruthlessly blotted out. Such is the intense conviction of the protagonists of the New Reformation.

A LIST OF POPULAR BOOKS ON THE REFORMATION AND CHURCH OF ENGLAND

E. W. WATSON: *The Church of England.* Williams & Norgate, 1914.
H. H. HENSON: *Anglicanism.* Macmillan, 1921. 8/6.
H. H. HENSON: *The National Church.* Macmillan, 1908. Out of print.
H. H. HENSON: *In Defence of the English Church.* Hodder & Stoughton, 1923. Out of print.
G. H. CURTEIS: *Dissent in its relation to the Church of England.* Macmillan, 1919. Out of print.
H. GEE: *The Reformation Period.* Methuen, 1909. 5/-.
A. FAWKES: *The Genius of the Church of England.* John Murray, 1917. Out of print.
R. D. RICHARDSON: *Conflict of Ideals in the Church of England.* John Murray, 1923. Out of print.
W. BOYD CARPENTER: *Popular History of the Church of England.* John Murray, 1911. 6/-.
E. T. ALLISON: *Lectures on English Church History.* B. Blackwell, 1925. 7/6.
CAMBRIDGE MODERN HISTORY: *The Reformation.* Cambridge University Press, 1903. 25/-.
A. C. HEADLAM: *The Church of England.* John Murray, 1925. 12/-.
L. DIBDIN: *Establishment in England.* Macmillan, 1932. 7/6.
J. TULLOCH: *Rational Theology in England in the Seventeenth Century.* Two volumes.) Blackwood & Sons, 1874. Out of print.
W. R. INGE: *The Platonic Tradition in English Religious Thought.* Longmans, Green & Co., 1926. 4/-.
F. J. POWICKE: *The Cambridge Platonists.* J. M. Dent, 1926. 2/6.
C. BEARD: *The Reformation in the Sixteenth Century.* Constable, 1927. 10/6.
MANDELL CREIGHTON: *The Church and the Nation.* Longmans, Green & Co., 1901. Out of print.
H. B. WORKMAN: *The Dawn of the Reformation.*
Vol. I, 'The Age of Wycliffe.' Charles H. Kelly, 1901. Out of print.
Vol. II, 'The Age of Hus.' Charles H. Kelly, 1902. Out of print.
RANDALL DAVIDSON: *Character and Call of the Church of England.* Macmillan, 1912. Out of print.
H. M. GWATKIN: *Church and State in England.* Out of print.
H. C. LEA: *History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences.* (Three volumes.) Sonnenschein, 1896. Out of print.
H. C. LEA: *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy.* (Two volumes.) Williams & Norgate, 1907. Out of print.
F. SEEBOHM: *The Oxford Reformers.* Dent, Everyman. 2/-.
C. G. COULTON: *Jesuits and the Middle Ages.* Simpkin Marshall, 1931. 1/-
C. G. COULTON: *Art and the Reformation.* B. Blackwell. 25/-.
C. G. COULTON: *The Mediaeval Scene.* C.O.P. 5/-.
C. G. COULTON: *Life in the Middle Ages,* 4 vols. C.O.P. 30/-.
A. F. POLLARD: *Henry VIII.* Longmans. 8/-.
A. J. FROUDE: *English Seamen of the Sixteenth Century.* Longmans. 6/-.